

Thomas W. Blakely to be postmaster at Langley, S. C., in place of T. W. Blakely. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1932.

James V. Askew, jr., to be postmaster at Lockhart, S. C., in place of J. V. Askew, jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1932.

William J. Hughes to be postmaster at Loris, S. C., in place of W. J. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1932.

Bessie T. Cooper to be postmaster at Mayesville, S. C., in place of B. T. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired April 18, 1932.

Neely J. Smith to be postmaster at Ridgeville, S. C., in place of N. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1932.

Ben Harper to be postmaster at Seneca, S. C., in place of Ben Harper. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1932.

TENNESSEE

Gussie Gobelet to be postmaster at Linden, Tenn., in place of Eva Shelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1932.

Beulah O. Hughes to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in place of J. S. Braswell, resigned.

TEXAS

Lillie J. Tolleson to be postmaster at Bardwell, Tex., in place of J. W. Render, resigned.

John W. Stegall to be postmaster at Holliday, Tex., in place of J. W. Stegall. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1932.

John A. Wilson to be postmaster at Knox City, Tex., in place of J. E. Clarke, removed.

Bassett R. Miles to be postmaster at Luling, Tex., in place of B. R. Miles. Incumbent's commission expires May 16, 1932.

George F. Bates to be postmaster at Lyons, Tex., in place of G. F. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

Mabel E. Bryant to be postmaster at Rockport, Tex., in place of M. E. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1932.

Hal M. Knight to be postmaster at Sterling City, Tex., in place of H. M. Knight. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

Ben M. Vick to be postmaster at Valentine, Tex., in place of B. M. Vick. Incumbent's commission expires May 23, 1932.

Oliver P. Maricle to be postmaster at Wichita Falls, Tex., in place of O. P. Maricle. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

UTAH

Harris B. Simonsen to be postmaster at Helper, Utah, in place of H. B. Simonsen. Incumbent's commission expires May 12, 1932.

VERMONT

Paul W. Higbee to be postmaster at Proctor, Vt., in place of W. H. Startup, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Jessie M. Martin to be postmaster at Concord Depot, Va., in place of J. M. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1932.

Nannie L. Curtis to be postmaster at Lee Hall, Va., in place of N. L. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expires May 14, 1932.

Charles E. Virts to be postmaster at Lovettsville, Va., in place of C. E. Virts. Incumbent's commission expires May 29, 1932.

John J. Ward to be postmaster at Nassawadox, Va., in place of J. J. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires May 14, 1932.

Richard F. Hicks to be postmaster at Schuyler, Va., in place of R. F. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expires May 2, 1932.

Samuel R. Gault to be postmaster at Scottsville, Va., in place of S. R. Gault. Incumbent's commission expires May 26, 1932.

WASHINGTON

Roy E. Edwards to be postmaster at Ritzville, Wash., in place of S. E. Edwards, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

George E. Hurd to be postmaster at Richwood, W. Va., in place of E. E. Deitz. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1932.

WISCONSIN

Henry F. Roehrig to be postmaster at Arpin, Wis., in place of Mae Wittmann. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1931.

John C. Chapple to be postmaster at Ashland, Wis., in place of J. C. Chapple. Incumbent's commission expires May 29, 1932.

George Ketz to be postmaster at Clayton, Wis., in place of C. J. Anderson, removed.

Charles E. Sage to be postmaster at Wild Rose, Wis., in place of C. E. Sage. Incumbent's commission expires May 17, 1932.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the heart of our hearts and the soul of our souls, sustain us with the courage of faith and with the light of hope. Allow these divinely inspired virtues to expel fear and anxiety and lead us on in the ways of right. Another Member, beloved and honored, has joined the ranks of the immortal dead. Bend to our prayer and bear company with us in our sorrow. Silent is that home as the companion of the years sits alone, looking out upon a barren earth, shadowed by that mysterious power that makes life's deep undertone. O Thou who art the messenger of sympathy and comfort, keep her close to that realm where angels have their birth and wear their garments of white and love through the eternal years. O Mighty God, hear us as our souls speak in tears of gratitude to Thee for the whisper of the Lord in our hearts: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." We praise Thee that the river of life flows on forever and the light is above us and rest is before us. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 205

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. EDWARD M. BEERS, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolutions the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. REED, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. MOSES, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. CAPPER members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 929. An act relating to the taking of depositions in cases arising under section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended;

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 3,000 additional copies of hearings held before the Committee on Manufactures of the Senate on the establishment of a national economic council;

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on the bill (H. R. 10236) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 3584) entitled "An act to require all insurance corporations formed under the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia to maintain their principal offices and places of business within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 277. An act defining and regulating power sites upon the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 660. An act for the relief of Hamilton Grounds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 929. An act relating to the taking of depositions in cases arising under section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 1385. An act for the relief of Dan Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1586. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter Paul Franzel, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1705. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2144. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Charles R. Thornton; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2393. An act to provide for the addition of the names of certain persons to the final roll of the Indians of the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2990. An act for the relief of C. O. Meyer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2991. An act for the relief of B. J. Sample; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3179. An act for the relief of Charles E. Bourke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3334. An act for the relief of William M. Sherman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3638. An act to authorize the use of public lands for camp sites, refining works, and other purposes in connection with mineral permits and leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3675. An act relating to the deferment and adjustment of construction charges for the years 1931 and 1932 on Indian irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3711. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the Chelan National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3830. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain land in the city of Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3847. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings; to the Committee on Labor.

S. 4038. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide home care for dependent children in the Dis-

trict of Columbia," approved June 22, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4235. An act to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1932; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4289. An act to amend the act of February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., title 47, sec. 85), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

S. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the cost of maintaining the present system of future trading in agricultural products and to ascertain what classes of citizens bear such cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Manob Suriya, a citizen of Siam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution creating a joint commission concerning the coordination and economical administration of the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

RADIO ADVERTISING

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a talk I made on radio advertising before the annual convention of the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to do so, I herewith insert in the RECORD a talk made by me at the radio session of the fifteenth annual meeting of the American Association of Advertising Agencies convened at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 15, 1932:

Chairman Gamble, members of the association, and invited guests, we are exceedingly fortunate this afternoon to have gathered in this room the leading representatives of four of the most influential factors in radio—the Congress of the United States, the Federal Radio Commission, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

Hon. EWIN L. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have very much enjoyed Senator DILL's address, as I am sure all of you have, and there is really no occasion for any other representative from Congress to discuss this question. He has covered it so fully and so ably and so entertainingly and I have prepared absolutely nothing whatever to say to you, not even in my own mind. I was scarcely able to be with you at all, because of official duties.

I am not going to make a speech, but I do wish to supplement what Senator DILL has said in a rather informal talk.

I am in accord with what Senator DILL has said, and I believe that that represents pretty well the congressional viewpoint. We are the legal custodians of the law regulating radio. Because of the situation, with which all of you are familiar, it was necessary for some functionary, some tribunal, to regulate radio; for reasons which were apparent to all that service could be rendered solely by the National Government, and the Federal Government having necessarily and properly assumed jurisdiction over the subject there goes with that authority a certain responsibility and obligation.

The Federal Government is the trustee for all the people in providing for the allotment to different citizens of the right to use the air through the instrumentality of the radio. It is assumed that the air belongs to all the people, that no one individual has any vested rights therein, and that radio consequently is a matter of public interest. Consequently radio should be regulated and administered in the interest of and for the benefit of the entire public, including all classes of citizens.

Those of us in Congress feel, therefore, that it is our duty to approach this subject from that standpoint. The interest of others is only incidental, so far as the interest of the whole public is concerned.

As I understand I am expected, as was Senator DILL, to talk with you with particular reference to radio advertising. I certainly would not be capable of talking to a convention of expert and experienced advertisers upon any other feature of their work, even if it were true (which it probably is not) that I am capable of discussing this one phase of your profession and problems.

In the first place I wish to state that, with Senator DILL, I am a believer in the American system. In fact, I think it is always better for functions of any kind, unless they be strictly governmental, to be administered by private citizens rather than through the Government. I think that that applies to radio. However, I am very decidedly of the opinion that the use of it should be and must be regulated in the public interest. And, of course, as we have a system now which is largely predicated upon advertising,

or rather funds raised from advertising, the question of advertising enters very definitely and importantly into the subject.

I always undertake to talk very frankly, either publicly or privately. I may be too candid sometimes, but that is my method, and I never mean anything offensive by it. I shall probably say some things that many of you do not approve. However, I want to state that whatever I may say will be said in an entirely kindly and friendly spirit. I am in no sense hostile to advertisers or advertising in the proper place and of the proper kind. However, I state without hesitation that I think we have decidedly too much sales talk over the radio, and I think that that is the general public opinion, and I think that that is proving harmful not only to the radio industry, to the broadcasting stations, but to the advertisers themselves.

Senator DILL enumerated certain powerful factors who are making a crusade against so much advertising over the radio. I have in mind a much larger, a much more important, and, to my mind, in the final analysis, a much more influential group than those which he mentioned. I refer to the rank and file of the listeners.

Having been for 12 or 13 years a member of the committee of the House which has jurisdiction over radio legislation, I have given the subject much consideration and as much investigation as I could. At all times, wherever I have been, I have been on the alert to learn what I could with respect to the public psychology as related to radio. Consequently, for years and years I have, to the best of my ability, been studying the public viewpoint, and I am sure that Senator DILL and I have somewhat more opportunity to get a general expression and a general knowledge upon that subject from various sources than is true with respect to the ordinary individual because of our connection with the subject of radio legislation. We receive letters constantly from everywhere giving the views of the listeners and of various other citizens upon the subject.

In addition to that, people talk with us frequently and constantly about the subject, and I know my colleagues who come from every section of the United States talk to me about the matter. They give their own reactions and they give the reactions of their constituents, which they receive through personal contact and through correspondence.

In the light of that study and of information coming through those various sources, I am convinced that there is a very considerable dissatisfaction with and reaction against the amount of sales talk now going on over the radio. And when that situation is being agitated and that feeling is being fanned by the aggressive elements which Senator DILL has mentioned, in my opinion it will reach such momentum that something will be done with the present system.

I want us to retain this system we have, but I want us to curb and to reform this system, not only in order that we will be able to retain it but in order that it may render the public service which radio can and should render.

My friends, radio is not maintained to sell goods. There is no justification for the Federal Government maintaining an agency for the purpose of advertisers to use in a commercial way. The only justification for advertising, for the commercial use of radio, is the use of it in such a way and to such an extent that it may be maintained financially for the purpose of rendering a greater and a larger public service.

Those are my views. And I want to state furthermore that I do not believe the public will stand for any other use of it in the final analysis.

With respect to the amount of sales talk that is being indulged in, more than two years ago I began giving public warnings along this line, before there was any pronounced public reaction. I talked with many of those engaged in the broadcasting industry. I have discussed it with them since. Many of them have all along said, "I think you are correct. I agree with you, but we will handle the situation ourselves."

However, instead of that situation, which is causing criticism, being remedied it has grown steadily worse. There is more advertising talk over the radio to-day, according to my observations, than there ever has been before.

Of course, you gentlemen naturally feel that I am not capable of giving you advice with respect to advertising, but, based upon my own observations and the things that I hear said around me constantly, as indicated before, I think that much of the advertising going over the radio now is overdone to such an extent that it has the opposite effect from that sought by the advertisers.

The purpose of advertising is to win good will for this, that, or the other commodity or service. When it does that, it is successful advertising. When it creates ill will it has the opposite effect, and it is very common to be in any group when a radio program is coming over the air and to hear expressions of disgust on all sides, on the part of the audience. In a case of that kind that advertising is doing the advertiser more harm than it is good and it is certainly doing that broadcast station or that chain system a great deal more harm than it is good.

Not only that, but when you indulge in so much of that advertising talk interspersed all through a program you are going to lose listeners, more and more.

I will tell you what my idea is: That you will get very much better results by having a moderate amount of advertising than you will by having the amount that is generally given now. For instance, this is what ordinarily happens: If there is a name advertised or if they mention some commodity, in a very brief statement, and then they go into the program the auditors will listen to all of it. But when they know from experience that when this announcer or this advertiser starts to talk he is going to talk for

a minute or 2 or 3 or 4 minutes, what happens? Do those listening sit there and listen through that talk? No. They start talking with each other; they either go to biffing this sales talk or they start talking about something else. So the advertiser loses the effect of even having them listen to what is being said. Then if the program goes on for a few minutes and then they go back to that advertising talk, the same thing occurs.

If you give the public only so much sales talk or so much advertising, they are willing to listen and absorb and you will be doing infinitely better for yourselves than you will if you make it so lengthy or so obnoxious that they will not listen to it at all and will turn away in disgust either mentally or physically. In other words, I am firmly convinced that a proper curb on advertising will not only be in the interest of radio generally but even in the interest of the advertisers themselves.

I don't know what experience you have had, but my observation has been such that I have become absolutely convinced beyond any peradventure of a doubt of the sentiment which I am expressing.

Another thing. As I suggested before, the Federal Government is trustee of this important function, of this function with such a tremendous potentiality. The public so regards us. They come to us with complaints if they think that we are not administering our trusteeship in a manner in which they think it should be administered. And as I stated before, the obligation does rest upon us to see that radio, which we have assumed to supervise and to regulate, shall be held on a high and an unobjectionable plane from every standpoint, in so far as that may be possible.

Right in that connection, the House of Representatives has passed, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate has reported, I believe, a bill which embraces a provision forbidding the conducting or advertising of lotteries or lottery contests over the radio. There has been very little objection even from the industry to that so far as I have heard, but we couldn't do otherwise. Certainly Congress and the Federal Government can not be put in the attitude of licensing citizens to violate the laws of every State in the Union over the radio.

I heard mention of these contests to-day. They arouse interest, yes. You can always arouse interest with a lottery. Why, the Federal Government could go into the lottery business and could conduct a great national lottery and raise enough money to run the Federal Government without any other taxes. Yes; that could be done. But we can't afford to do it. We can't afford to raise public revenue in that way. In like manner we can not afford to license individuals to do the same thing.

If we regulate and maintain radiobroadcasting upon a sane, sound basis and in a manner that it will render a service that is acceptable to the masses of the people, there won't be any difficulty about continuing the present American system, at least in principle. If we fail, however, to maintain it on that plane, you may rest assured that there will be such a reaction that the system will inevitably be changed.

I do not want to see that done, and so I give the warnings which I have to-day and heretofore, with a view to preserving the system and avoiding the destruction of it. But, as I say, I am convinced that there is room for reform, there is room for correction of evils.

I have discussed this subject—and they have come and discussed with me—with many men engaged in broadcasting and in other branches of the radio industry, including executives of broadcast stations and of broadcast systems. Almost without exception they agree that I am correct in principle. They approve all of it but they speak of difficulties. They say that "the advertising agencies insist upon more sales talk than we ourselves think is proper. We have trouble with them constantly."

I understand that the advertising agencies say they have trouble because of the insistence of their clients.

I don't know just how that is. I expect that is true. I suppose that the average individual advertiser is obsessed with the idea that if he is to pay for 15 minutes he should be able to talk just as much as they will let him about himself and his goods. But he is looking at it from an individual selfish standpoint. He is not looking at it from the interest of that broadcast station and he is not looking at it from the interest of the broadcast system generally. So perhaps the advertising agency feels that he may want too much advertising and maybe he will politely curb him just as much as possible but still agree to perhaps more than he himself thinks is wise. The same thing takes place between the advertising agency and the broadcast station.

There is an opportunity and a duty for everybody involved, but I will frankly say that I haven't a great deal of faith that it is possible for the industry itself to entirely eradicate an excessive amount of sales talk. Even if a majority of advertisers and a majority of the advertising agencies and a majority of the broadcast stations and systems were aware of the situation which I have undertaken to describe and were disposed to prevent an excessive amount of talk, there would certainly always be a considerable element who would persist in an excessive amount of sales talk.

And so one advertiser will go to one station—one agency—and he will be allowed to talk this much. One of his competitors will go through another channel and he will not be permitted to engage in so much talk. The latter naturally wants to have as much sales talk as his competitor, and so he will go to his station and say, "If you don't permit me to talk that much I shall have to go to the other station," and so he will go. That is the way those things work out.

I have very, very often been impressed with the fact that those in this industry, both the executives of broadcast stations and

advertisers themselves, especially those in advertising agencies, realize that this is carried too far and yet they are in somewhat of a vise. They are driven more or less by competitive conditions and forced frequently to agree to something which they themselves do not approve. Consequently I would frankly state, as I have heretofore, that I believe the only reform—and reform is absolutely necessary to preserve the system—will be some regulation by Congress itself, or rather some criterion laid down for the Radio Commission, so as to treat everybody alike, so that everybody will be on the same basis. In my opinion that would not only not result in hurting radio or the advertiser but it would really help both.

Therefore I do not consider that any suggestions I make in this regard are hostile to either. Of course, if permitted to run on in an unbridled way, it is doubtless true that for the time being more revenue might be received. But I am talking about the future. I am discussing what will result in the final analysis and we may as well look at that because we are going to be confronted with it, and not at any distant date, unless there is a change in the present system. I mean not so much the present system as the present practices.

I have thought over this matter a great deal. I have discussed the question of the method of regulation with a great many people in all branches of the radio industry as well as those who are not within the industry but who are interested in the subject and in the success of radio broadcasting, and I think that it is pretty generally recognized by all of those with whom I have discussed the subject that the practices can not go on to the extent they are going on now, with respect to excessive advertising. I should like for us to correct this situation before it reaches a point that the public will not be satisfied with the correction but will want to use the guillotine instead of the pruning knife.

We have so often seen a lack of recognition of a sentiment and a disregard of sentiment, until it finally got absolutely beyond bounds, and I am convinced that we are confronted with such a situation with respect to radio advertising.

I don't expect all of you gentlemen to concur in these views and conclusions. But as you were kind enough to ask me to come and talk with you I felt that you wanted my real, candid views and did not want or expect me to come down here simply for the purpose of attempting to entertain you. So I have in this very informal way given you very briefly and incoherently some of the thoughts which I have upon the subject, and I believe that that expresses the sentiment of a very large segment of the public, not to speak of the interests who, perhaps, may have a different motive, and which, as I said, were described by Senator DILL.

Instead of killing the goose that lays the golden egg let us all work together toward perfecting instead of destroying a great American system of radio control. I thank you. [Applause.]

Chairman GAMBLE. We thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for this very interesting talk.

Both Senator DILL and Representative DAVIS have expressed their willingness to answer questions. I hope that our members and guests will take full advantage of this unique opportunity for a personal exchange of views.

Mr. GANNON (New York): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the judge if he would state the type of regulation which he favors.

Chairman GAMBLE. Mr. Gannon has asked Judge DAVIS to state the type of regulation which he favors.

Representative DAVIS. Well, of course, that has been a moot question among those who feel that something should be done along this line, and various suggestions have been made.

My opinion candidly is that it should consist at least chiefly of name or indirect advertising and perhaps the use of a slogan. I agree thoroughly with you gentlemen who have stressed the difference between the quality of advertising. Some of it is objectionable, no matter how brief. Others are not so unless carried to an unusual length. But there is no way of defining or regulating the character and efficiency of an announcer or of a particular program. While there is undoubtedly a difference in the quality and in the acceptability of it from a listener's standpoint, yet notwithstanding that, I think that many of the programs are entirely too lengthy as far as advertising talk is concerned.

I think many of you gentlemen are aware of the fact that some of the most effective advertising in the history of advertising has been name advertising. I think entirely too much stress is laid upon purely elementary descriptions. For instance, if you are advertising a certain car, it isn't necessary to tell the public what a car is for or details which are familiar to everybody who is interested in a car. What you should do is get over to the public mind that particular car.

It is the same with regard to tooth paste. Anybody who is likely to buy tooth paste knows what it is for when he buys it. It isn't necessary to give a long detailed instruction as to how to use it.

So it is with various things. I think that by name advertising at appropriate intervals, and not too often, and perhaps by the use of some slogan which would drive home the commodity or the service, some brief statement of that kind, you will get more results than you will by a continued detailed discussion of a fundamental use of the commodity because you will hold the attention of the listener during the entire program and the entire statement; whereas, as I said, and I have observed it so often and have heard others say that they have observed, if you go into a

long sales talk they will quit listening and begin thinking about something else or talking about something else.

That is my view in a general way.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the judge a question?

Judge DAVIS seemed to be rather positive about the large number of people who object to the type of advertising credit that is now being employed. I should like to ask the judge if he has made any investigation—let me make this statement first: He has likewise evidenced a desire that we continue to give to the American people the kind of radio entertainment that they are getting at present. I should like to ask the judge if he has made any investigation as to what would happen to radio if the advertiser should be reduced to mention of name only and a slogan. Does he know or does he have any idea as to what use would be made of radio under those circumstances?

Representative DAVIS. It was used largely in that manner up until recent years, until the last two or three years. It started with name advertising. Advertising got in. It has gradually grown and grown and grown. It is my opinion that the advertiser would get just as good or better results and would continue to advertise as much as he does now.

That is my opinion.

Chairman GAMBLE. This closing session of the fifteenth annual meeting of the four A's has certainly been one of the most interesting in it. For its success we are deeply indebted to our distinguished guest speakers of this afternoon. We thank them.

MIRRORS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered from Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture, Arthur M. Hyde, over a chain of stations of the National Broadcasting Co. on Wednesday evening, April 20, 1932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered from Washington by Secretary of Agriculture Arthur M. Hyde over a chain of stations of the National Broadcasting Co., Wednesday evening, April 20, 1932:

O wad some power the gifle gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us
An' foolish notion.

Ever since Bobbie Burns penned those lines it has been considered good medicine to see ourselves as others see us. It is usually bitter stuff, but most medicines are beneficial in direct ratio to their bitterness. Mere introspection is valuable but usually biased. Looking into a mirror held by the other fellow is free from any favorable bias and reduces humptiousness. All of which leads to the observation that most of us in Washington have been looking with mingled pain and profit into mirrors held before us by a lot of people. In this the Department of Agriculture is no exception.

Sometimes, however, we suspect that the mirror is twisted. For example: Not long ago a distinguished Senator, his appetite keen for economy in all States except his own, leaped greedily upon the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to eradicate white-pine blister rust, a disease which threatens to destroy \$420,000,000 worth of white-pine timber, and to eradicate which the department is spending about one-tenth of 1 per cent of that amount annually.

The Senator was attempting to explain what white-pine blister rust is. He said: "White-pine blister rust is a little insect that first forms on the bark of the white-pine tree as a little worm, develops into a moth or fly, and then flies to a currant bush."

Here the Senator became somewhat muddy, but he seemed to feel, rather than think, that this determined moth next lays eggs on the currant bush, the eggs become worms, then change to flies or moths (I wish he'd make up his mind which), and at once dart back to the white-pine trees to do their deadly work. "The bud of the currant bushes," said the Senator, "or the sap of the currant seems to strengthen their boring qualities, and they bore through the pine a little bit."

I showed this esoteric bit of natural history to a scientist in the Department of Agriculture. He was aghast at the extent and novelty of the Senator's revelations in the field of biology. After he had recovered sufficiently, he told me the Senator's statement was accurate except for such minor details as these: White-pine blister rust is not a bug, moth, or fly, it is a fungus disease. It does not pick, peck, poke, or bore holes into the pine tree, but acts on a tree just like a germ disease does on a man. As much as we all admire the Senator and his uncanny ability to confuse insects with diseases, bushes with trees, and facts with fancies, we in the department suspect that the mirror he has held up to us is cracked.

Another "hot one," which originated on the floor of the Senate and has spread from New York to the Golden Gate, is that merry gibe at the Department of Agriculture about a bulletin alleged to be entitled "The Love Life of a Bullfrog." It was such a "rip

rarin' good one that it is a pity to spoil it. The cold facts, however, are:

1. No bulletin of that name was ever issued by any governmental department.

2. No bulletin dealing with frogs, their lives, legs, or loves, has ever been published by the Department of Agriculture.

In spite of the fact that the original gag isn't true, there is nevertheless a "good one" in the yarn which I must let you in on.

1. The gag was originated by Democrats to show how silly the Republicans are.

2. The only basis for it is a bulletin entitled "Frogs," which was published in 1919 by the then Democratic administration of the Department of Commerce.

3. The Democrats not only paid the expense of printing and circulating the bulletin, but they paid a Cornell professor \$1,700 for writing the manuscript.

All of which shows once more the desirability of examining the mirror before you ask the other fellow to look into it.

Another mirror into which we in the Department of Agriculture are continually gazing is a chart which, with an ominous and altitudinous curve shows that the expenditures of the department have jumped from \$30,000,000 in 1917 to \$300,000,000 in 1931. No explanation accompanies the chart. Consequently, two conclusions are immediately drawn. One: That in 14 years the low-browed bureau chiefs of the department have expanded their baleful activities by ten. Two: That from the work of these bureaucrats no benefits whatever have resulted. One genial editor, in a recent speech, charged us with being racketeers. This criticism would have been passed over as mild and reasonable except for the fact that the editor resides in Chicago and spoke with that authority.

I enter no defense for governmental extravagance. Projects which take money may be highly desirable in prosperity, and highly undesirable at other times. Consequently, I connived with the President to lop off from the appropriations for the Agricultural Department all that could be lopped off and still carry on the duties with which we are charged under the law. Congress can take more because by so doing they will relieve us of our obligations under the law. They have our blessing. They can take more if they choose. There will be no yelp from me. Our duties are whatever Congress makes them, and be our appropriations little or still less, we of the department will click our heels and carry on with whatever is left.

But before the department, its chief officers, or myself are held up to the country as having expanded our operations ten times, let us analyze that chart a little: One hundred and seventy-four million dollars of that \$296,000,000 spent in 1931 went for Federal highways, none in 1918; \$50,000,000 went to farmers in the form of drought-relief loans; \$14,000,000 went direct to the several States for experiment stations, extension services, and forest-fire prevention.

These three items aggregate \$238,000,000 of the \$296,000,000 charged to us in 1931. The funds were not appropriated because heavy-jawed bureau chiefs demanded them. The States wanted roads and crop-production loans and experiment stations, and Congress provided the money. We were merely the channel through which the money flowed from the Federal Treasury to the States.

Thus it is clear that only one dollar out of five appropriated to the Department of Agriculture goes for our own expenditures—and of this dollar nearly 60 cents goes for public-health services and conservation. The remaining 40 cents may be said to be purely agricultural.

Consequently when the mirror of increasing expenditures is held before the Department of Agriculture, we see not so much the work of bureaucracy as the demands of the States and of the people.

These statements are made not to minimize the need for economy nor to belittle any effort to cut down governmental expenditures but to point out some of the difficulties in the way of achieving those desirable ends. Beyond a doubt there exists in the vast and complicated machinery of government some of that sinister scheming and reaching for larger powers which is covered by the general term "bureaucracy." Nevertheless it is not bureaucracy which has built the machine and added millions to our tax burdens. The real culprit is the demand which has come from the people to relieve local burdens, from organizations of class or special interests to obtain special benefits from the Federal Treasury. To this demand Congress, which derives its mandates and its votes from the people, has lent an all-too-willing ear until we have built up a set of needs and a machine against which Congress is itself powerless. Local self-government has avoided its responsibilities and abdicated its powers. We have built our own Frankenstein.

Not the least of our difficulties is the fact that, by yielding to local and special demands, we have built up an ever-growing appetite for larger demands. I know of no better example of this than the so-called crop-production loans which the Department of Agriculture is making to farmers.

The genesis of crop loans lies in the action of President Wilson when, in answer to an emergency war need, he loaned small amounts in the Northwestern States to buy wheat for seed only. This action, proper as it was, immediately became a precedent which has been expanded in peace time far beyond its original intent.

The purposes of such loans have been expanded to include not only seed but feed for work animals, fertilizer, oil and gasoline for tractors, and repair of irrigation ditches. In 1931 the purposes were further expanded to include drought relief, feed for livestock, agricultural rehabilitation in all respects affecting

crops—and in 1932 to include loans wherever farmers are otherwise unable to obtain loans for crop purposes.

In my own three years at this post I have seen the amounts expand from \$6,000,000 in 1930 to \$67,000,000 in 1931 and \$200,000,000 in 1932.

A few weeks ago I protested against such loans and the enormous expansion in their purpose and amount. Immediately I found myself in the headlines.

One Senator charged me with being unsympathetic to farmers. I hope I am not lacking in sympathy with the American farmer. He is my client. His success is my job.

In opposing such loans I am not thinking of the burden such huge sums cast upon the taxpayers of this country (among them the farmer himself), but I am thinking of the welfare of the American farm family.

I assert that you can't save American agriculture by injecting it full of the opiate of credit. You may stimulate it temporarily. You may later lull it to sleep, but it will wake up next fall with all the painful reactions of surplus production and low prices. It will be burdened with an accumulated debt which will require years to pay off.

Seed loans may be justifiable and desirable when a visitation of nature, such as a storm, flood, or drought, has devastated whole counties or States and bears unequally as between individuals or groups of farmers. But when the exigency is economic and affects every one of us alike, the experience inherited by the farmer from his pioneer ancestors teaches him that the man who lives on what he has and borrows least will come through best.

The vice of Government loans is manifold. The Government can not make discriminations between the needs and the merits of individual citizens. We must loan not only to the worthy and the industries, but to the unworthy and the shiftless, provided only they come within the scant limitations of a general act of Congress. Such loans defy the inexorable economic law. They perpetuate in the competitive picture submarginal farmers and submarginal farms to the detriment of those who, but for the competition thus created, might succeed. They delay recovery.

When the money is going out, all is well. But when the attempt is made to collect it back, pandemonium breaks loose. Local interests want to collect the proceeds of the crop themselves. Political interests wheel into action demanding cancellation of the debt or a moratorium, or at least an extension of time. To the everlasting credit of the farmer be it said that he does very little of the howling. Also be it said that his own views are so much sounder than those of his representatives that during the very time that his representatives were dinning it into our ears that he could not pay, the farmer went ahead and paid over 60 per cent of our 1931 loans.

The farmer needs many things much more than he needs loans. He needs relief from the excessive burden of taxation which he bears. He knows that, because he is a consumer, much of the burden of taxes which is ostensibly loaded upon industry comes back to him in the price of what he buys.

He needs a consuming population which possesses a high buying power, not a population burdened with taxation.

The primary need of the farmer is not loans but a market, where he can sell his products at a fair price. To obtain this market, he needs an organization which will represent him. To obtain such an organization, the Government can help and is helping through the Farm Board. To hold such a market, he needs the protection of a tariff high enough to give him undisputed possession of the home demand. To reap full benefits of such a market, he needs to control his production to such volume as will balance with demand. Governmental funds will be more wisely employed in relieving the domestic market from the burden of existing surpluses than in stimulating by means of loans a larger production and an increased surplus.

The statement is frequently made that the President's program for recovery provides ample assistance for banks, railroads, and corporations, but none for "the little fellow." Such statements are utterly unfounded. It is true that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation makes its loans to such institutions, but its primary purpose is to release the strangle hold which fear and panic have had upon the credit and the job of "the little fellow."

The extent to which our difficulties are due to unreasoning fear and panic is hard to measure. Some indication may be had from the fact that although our foreign trade has declined (in dollars, not volume) less than 5 per cent of our productive capacity, our production has declined somewhere around 30 per cent. Yet the consumptive power of our people is just as large as it was at the heyday of consumption. Some part of the difference between 5 per cent and 30 per cent of our productive capacity is pure scare.

The distress of "the little fellow" during these last 30 months has been due to that scare. Fear and panic have been prolific causes of credit contraction. Bank failures and the shrinkage of railroad values have been the fuel upon which the flames of panic fed. The daily announcement of bank failures, in the days gone by, alarmed not only other depositors but other bankers. Each new failure tied up, not only the deposits of the failed bank, but forced other bankers to protect themselves against possible runs by demanding payment of loans, and by refusing to extend new credits. Thus by the spread of fear, credit was withdrawn from business. Consumption declined, and production was reduced. In turn, railroad tonnage fell off, and the value of their securities dropped. This added to the difficulties of the banks in which "the little fellow" had his savings and the insurance companies in which he carried his risks. Bank failures, contracting credit, falling buying power, declining production—it was along

this vicious circle as it spiraled downward that "the little fellow" lost his market and his job.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was given the job of reversing this process. Already the failure of banks has largely ceased, and this cause for alarm has been withdrawn. If the flow of credit to business is resumed, "the little fellow" will regain on the way up what he lost on the way down.

Those who criticize because loans are made to banks and other institutions should pause to remember, first, that all such institutions are required to put up adequate security and pay 5½ to 6 per cent interest, and, second, that we are living, not in a state of nature but in an organized society in which such institutions render a vital service to every one of us. To illustrate: You can get in Africa land as fertile as any to be had in this country. You can get all you want of it. It will cost you little or nothing. But you wouldn't have it even as a gift. You wouldn't have it because it has no banks, no railroads, none of the service corporations and institutions which are necessary to a civilized standard of living in an organized society. If we permit our banks to fail, credit will dry up and business will stop. If we permit our railroads to fail, farms will also fail. This is so perfectly obvious that even slight reflection will demonstrate the President's program to be primarily for "the little fellow" and an answer to his needs.

It was on this very point that a prominent Democratic candidate for President recently said:

"I will fight any candidate who persists in any demagogic appeal to the masses of the working people of this country to destroy themselves by setting class against class and rich against poor."

I am not in the habit of taking marching orders from Democratic sources, but here at last is a point upon which I line up with Al Smith.

While we are gazing into mirrors held up for us to look into, let us all look into a great mirror and see ourselves as a Nation. It will reflect back to us our own image, in the cold light in which we view the other fellow. Let us each ask ourselves what sacrifice we are making for the welfare of the Nation. We were heroes in war. We vied with each other in the glorious sacrifice and we won! What about peace-time sacrifices?

Congress can not do it all. Congress is your creature. It represents you. We shall solve many of our problems when Senators stop talking about "my State" and begin talking about "my country"; when Representatives forget their district and remember only the Nation. And that happy hour will occur when organizations massed behind special interests are willing to submerge those interests for the national welfare, when sectional interests are merged into the larger interests of the whole Nation, and individuals with pet projects are willing to offer them on the altar of national well-being. For, after all, Congress represents us as we are. Members of Congress are just as patriotic, just as wise, and just as courageous as we will let them be. The beginnings of wisdom, of patriotism, and of courage lie in each one of us—as individuals. That, after all, is the mirror which reflects a true picture.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, seldom is the House of Representatives honored by the presence of a distinguished lady guest. On yesterday women assembled in Washington from all the States of the Union elected a new leader. I refer to that organization of patriotic and public-spirited ladies known as the Daughters of the American Revolution. These ladies chose as their president general for the coming three years an esteemed constituent and personal friend of mine, Mrs. Russell William Magna, of Holyoke, Mass. She was accorded the unusual honor of being elected without opposition in recognition of her years of faithful and outstanding service to the organization.

It is a privilege and pleasure to present to the Members of this House the president general elect of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Russell William Magna, who, with her husband and father, is now in the Speaker's gallery.

I suggest that the House extend to her a hearty welcome. [Applause.]

FEDERAL PAY CUTS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, a petition protesting against Federal pay cuts, a mile and a quarter in length, signed by 24,000 taxpayers of Milwaukee, was to-day presented to Senators LA FOLLETTE and BLAINE and members of the Wis-

consin delegation in the House by representatives of postal employees' organizations. The petition was addressed to me as chairman of the House Post Office Committee, who turned it over to the Wisconsin legislators, including the Hon. JOHN C. SCHAFER and Hon. GEORGE J. SCHNEIDER on the east steps of the Capitol.

The petition is the result of an educational campaign carried on by the "Big Three" organizations of postal employees—the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, the National Association of Letter Carriers, and the Railway Mail Association. These groups, representing directly 150,000 postal employees, are acquainting business men with the fact that a Federal pay cut means a diminished purchasing power reacting against the restoration of prosperity in every community in the country.

The officials of the postal organizations making the presentation were: Leo E. George, Thomas F. Flaherty, and William Otte, of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks; Edward J. Gainor, M. T. Finnan, and Clarence Stinson, of the National Association of Letter Carriers; and William Collins, Henry Strickland, and J. F. Bennett, of the Railway Mail Association.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11452) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11452, the Navy Department appropriation bill, with Mr. FULLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk begins the reading of the bill I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. I rather think most of the members will be interested in this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, we carry on pages 25 and 44 of this bill provisions limiting flying pay to \$1,100 per annum. By reason of such action we have subtracted \$6,187 from the appropriation for the Naval Reserve, \$271,890 from the appropriation for pay of the Navy and \$16,130 from the appropriation for pay of the Marine Corps, or a total of \$294,207.

I am advised that on yesterday the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department informed the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BYRNS] that if the committee would remove the limitations on the amount of flying pay that might be paid to an individual officer, that the department would so administer the assignment of officers to flying duty as to make the reduced appropriation for pay of the Navy suffice. This would be accomplished, I understand, by refusing flight orders to officers whose duties do not make it essential for them to engage in aerial flights.

The committee is willing to accept that proposition as a substitute, and I shall move, when the paragraphs containing the limitations have been read, to strike them out, and to insert in the appropriations pay of the Navy and pay of the Marine Corps limitations on the total amount that may be expended for flight pay in conformity with the suggestion of Admiral Moffett. [Applause.]

The small amount—\$6,187—deducted from the appropriation for the Naval Reserve I shall move to restore.

In conclusion, I wish to read a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to Chairman BYRNS, dated April 21, 1932, relative to this matter.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,

Washington, April 21, 1932.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNS: Referring to the provision on page 25 of the naval appropriation bill, which limits so-called flight pay to \$1,100, may I urge that, in view of the grave uncertainty whether aviators will continue their voluntary acceptance of flight duty at

this limit of pay, that you support the amendment striking out lines 11 to 15 on page 25 and lines 10 to 12 on page 44. If this is done, the Navy feels that it can accept the reduction of flight pay elsewhere provided.

Very truly yours,

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

C. F. ADAMS.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. May I ask the gentleman whether the same will apply to the submarine service?

Mr. AYRES. Yes. We will make the same provision, of course, as to the submarine service.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If there is no joker in it, this looks good, and I will study it.

Mr. AYRES. I assure the gentleman he has my permission.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, I understand the position of the committee is that they will not recommend to the Congress a reduction in the base pay for flying service?

Mr. AYRES. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. I say that in view of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs held a hearing this morning at which the head of the Army flying service and others gave testimony showing the injustices which would follow if the limitation as carried in the Navy appropriation act was also carried in the Army appropriation act. So it is now the purpose of the Appropriations Committee to abandon that policy with reference to base pay?

Mr. AYRES. That is right. Of course, the gentleman means flying pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. Will that apply to both services?

Mr. AYRES. I can not speak for the Army.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will that apply to the Army as well as to the Navy?

Mr. AYRES. As I said to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I can not speak as to the Army.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. In view of what has just transpired I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he had any member of the Navy Department before his subcommittee personally to justify the bill that is now before the House, not the one as amended but the bill as it is now before the House, as affecting aviation and submarine pay decreases.

Mr. AYRES. Admiral Moffett filed a statement, which appears in the hearings.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is not answering my question. Did any member of the Navy Department come before the gentleman's subcommittee and testify?

Mr. AYRES. No; not as to reducing flying pay.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is the reason the bill is as it is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESERVE

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve and Naval Militia; pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when employed on authorized training duty; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to and from training duty; transportation of enlisted men to and from training duty, and subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enlisted men during the actual period of training duty; subsistence of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve while performing authorized training or other duty without pay; pay, mileage, and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve and pay, allowances, and subsistence of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve; pay of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve for the performance of not to exceed 48 drills per annum or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and administrative duties, exclusive, however, of pay, allowances, or other expenses on account of members of any class of the Naval Reserve incident to their being given flight training unless, as a condition precedent, they shall have been found by such agency as the Secretary of the Navy may designate physically and psychologically qualified to serve as pilots of naval aircraft, \$3,071,499, of which amount not more than \$150,000 shall be available for main-

tenance and rental of armories, including pay of necessary janitors, and for wharfage; not more than \$81,000 shall be available for employees assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the schedule of wages for civil employees in the field service of the Navy Department; not less than \$575,079 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for aviation material, equipment, fuel, and rental of hangars, and not more than \$336,375 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and the transportation thereof, and for all other expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay more than one officer of the Naval Reserve and one officer of the Marine Corps Reserve above the grade of lieutenant or captain, respectively, for the performance of active duty other than the performance of drills or other equivalent instruction or duty and/or the performance of 15 days' active training duty.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order on the proviso beginning in line 23, page 12, and extending to line 6 on page 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late. An amendment has been offered and is in the hands of the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 12, line 8, strike out "\$3,071,499" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,077,686."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, the effect of the proposed amendment is to take care of the aviation-pay matter that the gentleman just referred to.

Mr. AYRES. That is it exactly.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not make provision for taking care of the Great Lakes boats that have in the past been in the service and which are desired by many to be continued in the service for 1933.

Mr. AYRES. No; it is confined entirely to the restoration of \$6,187 for flying pay for reserve aviators.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY], because he may lose his rights if this amendment is adopted, whether he intends to offer any amendment to increase the appropriation as carried in this item?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I may inform the gentleman from Wisconsin that my amendment is waiting on the desk, and I understood I could offer the amendment after action was taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire what the amendment is? If we adopt the committee amendment, I will say to the gentleman, there will be no further amendment with respect to the total amount, and I do not want the gentleman from Michigan, or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], or anyone else to lose his rights. I am trying to act in a protective capacity here.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will suspend a moment, the Chair is informed that if the gentleman from Michigan cares to offer his amendment, he should offer it to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas, and should offer it now.

Mr. PITTENGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have the floor. For information, Mr. Chairman, may we have the proposed amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLANCY as an amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: On page 12, line 8, strike out "\$3,071,499" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,171,499."

Mr. STAFFORD. I now yield the floor to allow the gentleman to offer his amendment.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLANCY as an amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: On page 12, line 8, strike out "\$3,071,499" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,171,499."

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my three amendments is to make an appropriation of \$100,000 for the operation and maintenance on training cruises of five training ships and two Eagle boats.

These ships are stationed at strategic points on the Great Lakes at Chicago, Duluth, Detroit, Cleveland, and Toledo and provide for the yearly training of 2,960 officers and men who would help to operate in time of war the additional war ships and transports which would be put into the service to defend the country.

The committee has cut out over \$600,000 as the cost of training naval reservists on training ships on fresh and salt water.

My amendments merely aim to restore \$100,000 of this \$600,000 plus and to add specific language to make sure that the Great Lakes training is included in the program for the navigation season of the year 1932. A number of great States with a population of about thirty millions of people is covered by this item.

These States are New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

SPRUNG AS A SURPRISE

The members of the appropriations subcommittee have repeatedly admitted that the Navy Department did not take them into its confidence in its alleged plan to junk and sell these five ships and two Eagle boats on the Great Lakes. The chairman, Mr. AYRES, said yesterday that the first belated notice came through an item in the Army and Navy Journal. Mr. TABER, of New York, of the committee, also said on the floor yesterday the same thing, and that notice came after his committee hearings were closed.

Earlier this week Members of the House—for instance, Mr. WHITE, of Ohio, and Mr. PITTINGER, of Minnesota—said they had been informed by the Navy Department that the purpose is to sell and junk the ships which have cost millions of dollars for what can be practically gotten for them as old iron. Members of the subcommittee insist the ships will not be junked.

These ships are not obsolete with possibly one exception. They have been modernized and are safe and can provide for the yearly training of 3,000 men. Two of the ships just last year cost \$150,000 in improvements and were changed from coal burning to modern, economical, oil-burning ships.

Certainly we ought to clear up the confusion which exists in the minds of the Members of the subcommittee and of the House as to just what the Navy Department intends to do with these ships. Some say on the floor of the House they will not be junked and others say just as positively on the floor they will be junked.

GREAT LAKES TRAINING BEST

The Navy Department claims that salt-water training is better than Great Lakes training for the naval reservists, who will be expected to operate ships in time of war both in navigating the ship and in running the engine room. Admiral Simms, the United States Navy chief at Chicago, and the naval reservists say just as positively that the Great Lakes training is much superior to the open-ocean training because of the difficulties of navigating the river and lakes of the Great Lakes and of the presence of a tremendous amount of traffic day and night.

A LOSS AND NOT A SAVING

The Navy Department say they will save \$36,000 per year by junking these ships and taking the 3,000 naval reservists of the Great Lakes region to salt water by railroad and maintaining them there.

The officers of the United States Naval Reserve Association say just as positively that these figures are false, and

that instead of saving \$36,000 they will lose much more than that amount by the greater cost of transportation, and so forth.

My amendments do not aim to restore the summer cruises. Mr. TABER, of the subcommittee, who has made a deep study of the question, says he is not in favor of the summer cruises this year, but that he does believe in the week-end cruises. My amendments provide for the week-end cruises this year and next summer.

PASSING THE BUCK

Chairman AYRES says that the Navy Department is recommending this action, and that they are the experts and we should take their word for it; but the Navy Department has made mistakes before and will make them again, and is making them now.

We can not pass the buck to the Navy Department. The responsibility is ours. We can not alibi ourselves by saying that we took the recommendations of the bureau chiefs.

Some say we can not afford this \$100,000 for national defense. I hold in my hand a newspaper photograph of the *Dubuque*, a fine serviceable gunboat with oil-burning engines, covering the Detroit district. Last year it cost only \$27,000 to operate. It can carry about 250 men on a cruise and afford them training. This summer and next summer it can be operated much cheaper than \$27,000.

THE DEADLY PARALLEL

The Appropriations Committee say we can not afford fifteen or twenty thousand dollars for that boat, but the Appropriations Committee say that we can afford about \$3,000,000 per year on the Detroit front for a fleet of rum chasers and patrolmen.

I hold in my hand large newspaper photographs of a part of the rum-chasing fleet on the Detroit front which went into commission a few days ago, on April 16. Here they are, 50 of them, expensive motor boats, most of them practically new. See the tremendous wake they make as they tear across the water, some of them going 60 miles an hour and eating up every hour tremendous amounts of taxes in gasoline. This is only a part of the fleet. There are many Eagle boats and Coast Guard cruisers much larger than these motor boats. These border patrolmen and their boats cost at least \$3,000,000 per year on that front, and yet you say you can not afford fifteen or twenty thousand dollars to save the *Dubuque*?

MILLIONS FOR PROHIBITION

There are about 150 customs border patrolmen on the Detroit front. There are about 230 Coast Guard men on the Detroit front, which extends to Buffalo, and their orders allow them to mobilize on the Detroit River for an emergency. There are also about 230 immigration border patrolmen on the Detroit front, thus making about 600 Federal border patrolmen who are superimposed upon about 3,500 policemen, deputy sheriffs, marshals, State police, and so forth, who are supported by city, county, and State taxes.

You might say that they are necessary to watch the 3,500 other policemen, but the customs border patrolmen on the Detroit front have been the most corrupt force in the history of American police work.

The United States Commissioner of Customs a few years ago, testifying before high Canadian officials at Ottawa, Canada, said that 90 per cent of them were dishonest or inefficient.

Every year tremendous scandals develop and a number of these customs officials are sent to Leavenworth or Atlanta by United States courts. They have shot innocent men and they have terrorized men, women, and children.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, you say that you can afford millions per year for men of this sort and you can not afford \$100,000 for the Naval Reserves, who are the very highest type of American manhood according to all the testimony—sober, honest, patriotic, and intelligent.

Every high Government official in charge of the border patrol testifying recently before House and Senate committees said that the Canadian embargo on liquor is efficient and that very little of it is coming across the Canadian border, probably 1 per cent of all the liquor used in the United States; and yet you are willing to throw away millions of dollars on this parasitic service and also to destroy an arm of the national defense, the Naval Reservist boats of the Great Lakes.

I regret to have to bring in the question of prohibition enforcement, but the very same House Appropriations Committee which seems to take a vague stand on the destruction of these five training ships and two Eagle boats on the Great Lakes is the very body of men who say that it is necessary to waste all this money on these prohibition-enforcement speed boats, Eagle boats, and cruisers.

Why, if you would just eliminate the cost of five of these motor boats and the salary of the men necessary to run them for one year, you could run the *Dubuque* easily for two summers.

You have a number of prohibition-enforcement torpedo-boat destroyers on salt water, some of them with crews of 80 or 90 men; and if you just laid up one of those prohibition cruisers for one year, you could run the entire training fleet on the Great Lakes for at least a few years.

If you tied to the dock one cruiser of the regular Navy, you would not have to curtail this Naval Reserve training in any respect, summer cruises and all.

You say you can not afford the \$100,000 for all these ships. That statement is extremely inaccurate, to say the least.

BREAKING FAITH WITH DETROIT

I have in my hand resolutions passed by the Common Council of Detroit, April 19, 1932, protesting vigorously against the Navy Department breaking faith and the implied contract existing between Detroit and the Federal Government which was made when the city of Detroit gave about a million dollars' worth of property to aid in this naval training.

BREAKING CONTRACT WITH STATES

I hold in my hand a similar resolution passed by the house of the State legislature at Lansing, also protesting against the Navy Department for its proposed scheme to abolish naval training on the Great Lakes and the junking of these ships, breaking faith and the implied contract with the State of Michigan which was made when the legislature was induced to appropriate \$600,000 recently to aid this Federal naval training.

What is true of Michigan is true of Illinois, which gave \$800,000 for this naval-training work, and Ohio, which gave \$200,000, and New York, which gave \$500,000.

The Navy Department breaks its word of honor and its implied contract, alleging that it can save \$36,000 per year, whereas the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association, a body of honest, patriotic, intelligent men, claims that a great loss to the taxpayers will result.

The Government claims it can not take care of these reservists who are mostly not on salary and who give up their time and energies as an arm of the national defense, and yet it can put on these waters a couple of hundred Customs and Coast Guard border patrolmen, prohibition-enforcement agents, to watch over 3,500 policemen who are paid out of the city, county, and State coffers.

Every year a large number of these Detroit border patrolmen are sent to Leavenworth or to Atlanta to "the big house," and it is estimated that it takes only three months to corrupt a new force. Are you going to say to the taxpayers that you can pay \$3,000,000 every year for a border patrol and a worthless fleet of boats like this, 50 fast speed boats eating up gasoline, parasitic, and doing no good, but that you can not afford \$15,000 or \$20,000 per year to maintain this historic gunboat, the *Dubuque*, which is doing a great deal for the national defense?

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Will the gentleman explain to the House the amounts of money the several States have contributed voluntarily toward this matter?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes. Michigan gave \$600,000. Illinois, thinking the United States Government would keep its implied contract, gave \$800,000. Ohio gave \$200,000, and New York gave \$500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Thirty million people are affected directly in six or seven States, and several gentlemen from these States wish to discuss the matter.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I have an amendment that will strike out the proviso at the bottom of page 12 and that may require some considerable time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 43, noes 55.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making a statement to the House. It is perfectly satisfactory, of course, to have unnecessary debate if the House wants to, but I serve notice on the House now that we will have a Saturday session unless this bill is completed to-day. If the House wants to stay here to-morrow, we will be glad, of course, to discuss these matters at length, or as long as you want to, but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] made the motion simply for the purpose of expediting the passage of the bill. He had no other purpose save the view and the hope that it would be possible to conclude it to-day and take a recess over to-morrow until Monday.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Tennessee can stop debate much more quickly than under 30 minutes on this amendment if they will ask that the rules be enforced. In other words, let us have five minutes debate on each side of each of these amendments.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to enforce the rules if the House wants to stay here, but I want gentlemen to understand that if we continue this debate we will meet to-morrow to complete the bill.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, we do not want to consume unnecessary time; but if the gentleman will ask for a show of hands as to the number of members here who want to talk, I think he will find there may be only five or six, and then we can go ahead, but we fear the gentleman is not going to give opportunity to discuss the question.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not want any gentleman on the floor of the House to think that personally I would cut off anybody. I simply want gentlemen to understand the facts and to understand the necessity of completing the bill to-day or of meeting to-morrow to complete it. I shall be here anyway.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There is no desire, Mr. Chairman, to prolong debate unnecessarily, but this is an important proposition to the Members coming from the Great Lakes districts. The amendment proposes to increase the appropriation, as recommended, \$100,000. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] has already offered to increase the appropriation

\$6,000 for a fad aviation service. We are only seeking an appropriation of \$94,000 for an essential service, which is as essential to the fleet reserve as the camp maneuvers are to the National Guard during the summer encampments.

It is now proposed by the department that, instead of having these Naval Reservists, who are the same as National Guard men, trained for two weeks on vessels on the Great Lakes, where the States have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars for the maintenance of that service, that service should be discontinued after September of this year, and instead the Naval Reservists should be transported thousands of miles to the seaboard for that character of training.

It has been the aim and endeavor of the War Department Appropriations Committee to have similar exercises, as far as the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the citizen's military training camp service are concerned, carried on proximate to the places where the men are organized for the sole purpose of saving transportation expense. Now, seamen can not be developed by being trained on land. We must have vessels; and it is just as essential to have a vessel on the Lakes where they can have week-end training as well as the two weeks' training as it is for an infantryman to have a musket in order to be properly trained.

The restrictive proposal is being carried altogether too far. There is only \$100,000 involved. I hope the gentleman from Kansas, in his magnanimous spirit, will agree to the \$100,000 in order to keep these vessels on the Great Lakes. The gentleman knows I have tried to cooperate in every endeavor for economy, but it is my firm opinion, after reading the hearings, that here is a place where we can really economize by allowing \$100,000 for the maintenance of these vessels. Will the gentleman from Kansas not accede to that reasonable request?

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I would say to the gentleman the committee did not initiate this. The responsible officials of the Navy Department came before our committee and stated that as a measure of economy this step had been taken. Now, we do not wish to be placed in the position of asking the Government of the United States to spend money which the department itself is trying to save.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, it is not always that the Secretary of the Navy, who hails from the classic atmosphere of Cambridge, knows what the conditions are on the unsalted seas of the Middle West. He might know something about Boston, but he does not know of the practices that are indulged in on the Great Lakes. He has not qualified in that particular. In this bill, on yesterday, we carried \$100,000 or more for training marines at schools supported by four States along the seaboard. We are only wanting what is fair. We want to educate the Secretary of the Navy in order to broaden him in his knowledge. He has too much classical atmosphere about him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman propose that the Secretary of the Navy shall serve an apprenticeship on one of these training ships?

Mr. STAFFORD. It would have been far better if he had gone West to get some knowledge of the liberal thought and ideals that prevail in the West, especially as to maritime conditions on Lake Michigan and Lake Erie and Lake Superior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the motion which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] proposes to discuss?

Mr. SHREVE. I propose to discuss training schools and ships on the Great Lakes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman rise in opposition to something pending before the committee?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. I am in favor of the amendment that is now before the committee to add \$100,000.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I have lived on the shores, within a short distance of the shores of Lake Erie, all my life, and I think I know something about the proposition.

One hundred and thirteen years ago the world's fleet was built right in Erie harbor. Erie is my home city. The first battleship that was ever built on any waters was the old *Michigan* that was built on Lake Erie. For more than a hundred years that great body of water has been recognized by the Navy in Washington as one of the finest and best places to train men for service on the seas. Why? Because, as one of the gentlemen who has preceded me has already stated, there are the dangers of navigation. John Sharp Williams, on the floor of this House, once said that more freight passed through the harbor of Detroit and down the Lakes than passed out of New York, London, Hong Kong, China, and Buenos Aires. When vessels seven and eight hundred feet long, carrying 12,000 tons of freight, are placed on that inland sea, there is an opportunity to test the navigating abilities of the men who are trying to run a ship, a great deal better than if they are sent out on the ocean to float around in the sunshine, and not have any of that experience that they get in navigating the Great Lakes.

I am amazed when I hear there is a thought of doing away with those ships and that they are going to be scrapped. In the old days men who received their training on the Great Lakes would never have thought of such a thing.

The old *Michigan* spent its winters in our harbor. Its officers and men married our girls, and for a long time the city of Erie was known as the mother-in-law of the Navy. Those old-time commanders would not have thought of destroying the training ships on the Great Lakes. They would have been in favor of building more ships, because they knew exactly what it meant. They knew that men trained on the Great Lakes were far superior to those who received their training on the ocean.

I hope this motion will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit another unanimous-consent request, that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute to support the motion of my colleague [Mr. CLANCY]. We are all in favor of economy and the reduction of expenditures by the Government to the lowest point possible consistent with the welfare of the people. The only difference of opinion arises over what activities shall be curtailed and to what extent the expenditures for any given services shall be reduced.

The naval unit of my home city, Grand Rapids, Mich., Division 13 of the United States Naval Reserve Forces, has ranked first in the report of the Naval Reserves Inspection Board for the last several years. The members of the organization there have taken great pride in their work and are very enthusiastic about it. It would be exceedingly unfortunate to do anything here that would dampen or discourage that enthusiasm. The failure to pass the amendment offered by my colleague will not only deprive them of training of great benefit to them and to the Government but it would at the same time go a long way to destroy their morale. What is true of the Grand Rapids unit is equally true of other units around the Great Lakes. For one, I trust the motion of my colleague will prevail.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, 15 years ago we went to war in a condition which permitted us to train men while we stood behind the defenses of our allied armies. While those with whom we were fighting were protecting us we attempted to train both officers and men.

Here is an organization, the Naval Reserve, that is used not only for men who were trained then but men of education who want to be trained now in order that they might help us if such an emergency should arise in the future. As to the probability of that emergency I shall not speak, but I will say that speeches were made on the floor of this House less than two months before the World War started to the effect that there was no chance of war and that there were no signs of war. Speeches were made on the floor less than two months before we went into the World War to the effect that we could not possibly get into it. So you can not take for granted any such eventualities, because you can not see them coming.

I want to say to you that in my opinion this is an effort to destroy the entire reserve force of both the Marine Corps and the Navy for the purpose of preserving the money for the regular Navy forces. [Applause.] It is not economy in any sense to attempt to destroy ships which two years ago were remodeled. Besides the two ships my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY] mentioned, a ship in my own home city was overhauled in 1930 at an approximate cost of \$40,000. To scrap that ship at this time would be a rank and inexcusable extravagance.

I insist to you that the building of this reserve force has made a valuable and useful arm of the defensive service of this country.

I want to call your attention to some figures in connection with the Marine Reserve, which we are not discussing now but will come to later. In 1928 and 1929 it cost \$459 per member of the organization trained. In 1930 and 1931 it cost \$62. These men in the Naval Reserve are willing to go on the same basis of no pay and no money for uniforms. Those whom I have been able to reach have expressed a willingness to even provide their own mess if these ships are preserved for them.

These men have been willing to cut down the force in charge of this ship to one officer and three enlisted men as ship keepers for half of the year, or during the summer months, and five during the winter. This cost for one ship will be about \$30,000. These men are willing to go on this basis.

To scrap these ships will be a rank destruction of something that we spent money on two years ago, and will not be a saving in any sense of the word.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Can the gentleman see any justification for Members of Congress who are trying to reduce expenses to vote \$100,000 into this bill when the Navy Department says it does not want it and does not need it?

Mr. WHITE. The Navy Department is attempting to destroy this part of the civilian service.

Mr. BYRNS. What right has the gentleman to make such a serious charge against the Navy Department?

Mr. WHITE. I insist it is true.

Mr. BYRNS. Here is an order issued by the Navy Department discontinuing training up there after September 1, and yet the gentleman proposes that we vote \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money when the department says it does not need it.

Mr. WHITE. I still maintain that my charge is true. Why not sink a battleship to save money? That would do it. That is the same principle exactly.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that when the hearings were held before the subcommittee on naval expenditures no such program was presented, and is it not the fact that after the hearings were printed, after the committee had ceased its deliberations, without a single objection or without any support of the Naval Reserves, the Navy Department then issued this order to junk or decommission these vessels, and is it not a further fact that the economy that is being practiced, if there is any, is at the expense of the Naval Reserve Force and not at the expense of the other branches of the Navy?

Mr. WHITE. Exactly; and I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. FRENCH, and Mr. AYRES rose.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, 8 minutes of the 20 minutes for discussion on this paragraph has been used by those in favor of the amendment. I shall certainly insist on only 2 minutes more being used for that purpose and that those in opposition have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's position is well taken, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for two minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BYRNS] asked the gentleman who just preceded me what justification there is for asking an additional \$100,000 for the purpose of keeping these ships in commission, these Naval Reserve officers, and men on the Great Lakes, if we are to put into effect the economy program we are all so anxious to see adopted.

We have 3,000 officers and men in the Naval Reserve on the Great Lakes. Since time began for us a part of our naval force has been trained on these waters. Conditions for training naval personnel there are ideal. I wonder if you gentlemen know that it is the policy of the Navy Department, if this legislation goes through, to in the future train these naval reserves on the Atlantic Ocean. This is the program, and I wonder if you gentlemen know just how much it will cost to transport these 3,000 men to the Atlantic coast and back again each year. It will cost just \$50,000 more than the amount involved in the amendment.

If we are trying to reduce the expenses of government, if we are trying to do something for the sake of economy, here is an opportunity to practice it and at the same time show the people of the States bordering on the Great Lakes that Congress appreciates the substantial appropriations made each year by those States to assist in the training of this naval personnel.

It is not a matter of importance to me, Mr. Chairman, whether or not the Naval Reserve is trained in one place or another. It is important, however, that this training be given where it will be most effectively done for the least expense. An examination of all the facts will convince anyone that transferring these activities to the Atlantic will add to rather than reduce the cost, and this without adding in any way to the efficiency of the corps. As a matter of fact, it is believed by the officers of the corps that the training on the lakes is, because of its peculiar effectiveness, vastly superior to that given with the fleet on either the Atlantic or Pacific.

I believe the first thing in connection with this or any other question that should be considered by Congress is the welfare of the country. Everyone knows, who knows anything about our past wars, that our regular Navy and our Regular Army are the first lines of defense. Our Naval Reserve and the National Guard are next called upon. It is upon the foundation formed by these arms of the service that the entire war strength of the Nation must be built. The peace-time strength of neither the Army nor the Navy is such as even to properly police the country, man our coast defenses and strategic points on the one hand, or to properly man our available fighting ships on the other.

On the call to arms it is the reserves in both services that are first called to the colors. They must be fit for any duty. They must be ready to meet any demand made upon them. They must be able to take their places alongside their fellows of the Regular Establishments without loss of time for further training. This they can not do unless they are given something more than a bare 15 days' training per year. They will have this, as they have in the past, if these ships are kept in commission and these men are permitted to continue to train as they have trained in years gone by.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] has told you something of the splendid traditions of these civilian sailors of the Great Lakes. They are of a nature to inspire every member of the corps all down the years to come. The spirit of enthusiasm for the service should not be killed. The adoption of the amendment will preserve it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment, and in order that others may have time I shall try to limit my remarks to two or three minutes.

One of the gentlemen, a moment ago, said that the Members of the Congress are in favor of retrenchment and reduction in national expenditures except, he said, in the matter of allocation. The trouble is we are in favor of reduction when it touches the other fellow, but opposed to it when it touches an area or a community in which we are interested.

The gentleman who has just spoken referred to the cruises and to the trips that would be made to the sea and the extra expense over the method that has been followed in the past and that which would be followed if the cruises were made upon the Great Lakes. The trouble with this argument is that it is not involved in the pending amendment, because the Secretary has already determined the course for the coming fiscal year. There will be no cruises either upon the Great Lakes or with the ships of the Navy at sea.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Not now.

The problem, then, is whether or not we are going to put this additional money into the bill for the purpose of retaining these ships for the coming year.

I may say there is carried in the bill now something like \$52,000, which will be adequate to care for these ships until the first of the coming year. In the meantime, all the evidence touching upon the problem that the gentleman from Michigan who preceded me suggested, and any other factors may be considered by the committees of the Congress and by the department, and that will be ample time for us to consider whether or not we shall withdraw these four craft from the naval establishment or whether we shall continue the program that has been followed during the last some years.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has mentioned the remarks I made and has commented upon them.

Mr. FRENCH. I am sorry, but I must yield the floor to members of the committee on the other side.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time I have I would like to call the attention of the House to the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk, which strikes out the proviso beginning on line 23, page 12, and running over to page 13. This proviso will take out the reserve service—it does not cost any money—and it will conform to the desire of the Navy Department. This language, if it stays in the bill, will take out of the reserve force such officers as Commodore Forscheu, of New York; Capt. Edwin Evers, the most efficient officer in the reserve force; and many other men who have given the best part of their lives to this fine service. They are qualified for any duty in any emergency, and will build up the personnel of the regular Navy when called upon to do so.

My amendment will not cost an additional dollar. It is only in line with the desire of the Navy Department for greater efficiency in the reserve force. I hope you gentlemen will lend me your assistance and give to the Navy what it wants. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this proviso as worded, when taken in connection with basic law, would seem to deny all officers above the grade of lieutenant from receiving pay other than for 15 days' training duty. Basic law (sec. 21 of the act of February 28, 1925, to provide for the creation, and so forth, of a naval reserve and Marine Corps Reserve) provides that officers above the grade of lieutenant shall not be entitled to pay for the performance of drills or equivalent instruction or duty, but they shall receive pay for the performance of appropriate duties. Since the savings for the appropriate duty pay of officers above the grade of lieutenant, as con-

tained in the Budget, were not deleted from the appropriation, and no mention of this feature was contained in the committee report, it is believed that it was not the intention of the committee to deprive all Naval Reserve officers above the grade of lieutenant from receiving their appropriate duty pay.

Of the reserve officers above the grade of lieutenant now on active duty, there are many who have been performing their duties long and efficiently. Under the proviso objected to, they would have to be replaced with new and untried personnel. The principle of discharging old and faithful servants of long service and their replacement with new personnel at the slightly lower rates of pay for the sake of the comparatively small savings involved, is considered to be unjust and not conducive to the highest efficiency. Through certain changes which have recently taken place, there are certain positions or offices held by reservists which can be vacated entirely. Through the savings effected in this way, sufficient money is now contained in the bill to permit the retention of the various officers of the higher grades which the bureau desires, without any increase in appropriation. The retention of these officers can not, however, be effected within the terms of the proviso.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, answering very briefly the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], I will state that it will cost more than \$30,000 if you strike out this proviso. The gentleman is in error when he says it will not cost a dollar.

Now, inasmuch as he predicated his whole argument on the statement that it would not cost more, I think that a sufficient answer, since his amendment was evidently offered because of misinformation.

In reference to the other matter, discussed at great length and with much feeling, no member of the subcommittee would detract in the slightest degree from the fine and well-deserved tribute paid to the reserves in the States bordering on the Great Lakes. They are efficient, loyal, and serve with a splendid spirit. We are treating them like other reserves, and have followed the advice of the Navy Department in doing so.

The amendment as offered, carrying an additional \$100,000, does not require that the President and the Secretary of the Navy must spend it. It is left to their discretion.

Let me read to you the order:

For economical reasons, all 15-day training cruises now scheduled for Fleet Naval Reserve division, all districts, will not be made this summer and instructions pertaining thereto are canceled.

All 15-day training cruises and all 15-day training duties are eliminated for entire fiscal year '33. Above eliminations do not apply aviation divisions.

Week-end cruises authorized as heretofore.

The appropriation carried in the bill as reported carries sufficient funds to provide for cruises through September.

It likewise provides funds for the care of the ships up to January, and if when we re-assemble in December the ideas of the Navy Department should change, we can provide funds for the rest of the year, if it is then thought wise to do so.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Not just now. The Navy Department has full knowledge of these matters. They recognize the fine service that these reservists are rendering, but they are trying to cooperate with Congress in its effort to reduce expenses. They have frankly said, "Here is where we believe without hurt to the service we can effect a saving," and that is why the committee has recommended this to the House. The Navy Department has said in advance, "Do not give us this because, forsooth, we might not spend it if you did give us the money. We feel that we are prompted by the same desire and the same purpose as Congress is manifesting in keeping down appropriations." Under the circumstances would the House have expected the committee to pay no attention to what the Navy Department recommends, and which largely reduces this appropriation?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. Is there anything to the statement that these vessels are to be junked?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There is nothing, so far as the committee knows. These vessels are provided for until January and an officer is assigned to the district to that date, and this appropriation that we have recommended carries every dollar necessary to carry on the cruises to the end of September, and likewise provides for the care of ships to January.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Alabama has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLANCY) there were—ayes 68, noes 73.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CLANCY and Mr. AYRES to act as tellers.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 105, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 22, after the word "vessels," insert a comma and the following: "including the training vessels and Eagle boats on the Great Lakes."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that that is an amendment to the amendment. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 127, noes none.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I now offer my amendment as an amendment to the end of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 22, after the word "vessels," insert a comma and add the following: "including training vessels and Eagle boats on the Great Lakes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLANCY) there were—ayes 52, noes 70.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CLANCY and Mr. AYRES to act as tellers.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 63, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRITTEN: Page 12, line 23, strike out all of the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRITTEN) there were—ayes 39, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PITTENGER: Page 13, add the following at the end of line 6: "Provided, That the Navy Department shall not put into effect its plans, revised or otherwise, to withdraw and decommission the training vessels and Eagle boats on the Great Lakes now being used for the Naval Reserve."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a limitation. It limits the expenditures that might be made to junk these ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to the fact that, in line 18, on page 12, the word "rental" is misspelled.

Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For the procurement, maintenance, and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, to institutions at which one or more units of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps are established, of such means of transportation, books, supplies, tentage, equipment, and uniforms as he may deem necessary, and all other miscellaneous items, including cleaning and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps or on board ship; and to pay commutation in lieu of uniforms at a rate to be fixed annually by the Secretary of the Navy; for transporting supplies and equipment from place of issue to the several institutions, training camps, and ships, and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for the establishment and maintenance of camps of instruction, and schools on ships for the further practical instruction of members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from camps, ships, or other designated places of instruction, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps or ships and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit or, in lieu of transporting them to and from such camps or ships and subsisting them while en route, to pay them travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp or ship and for the return journey thereto, and to pay the return travel pay in advance of the actual performance of the travel; for pay of students attending advanced camps or advanced schools on ships at the rate prescribed for enlisted men of the seventh pay grade; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at a rate not exceeding the cost of the commuted ration of the Navy; for medical and hospital treatment, subsistence until furnished transportation, and transportation when fit for travel to their homes of members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps injured in line of duty while at camps of instruction or on ships; and for the cost of preparation and transportation to their homes and burial expenses of the remains of the members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who die while attending camps of instruction or on ships; and for the cost of maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, \$90,085: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for any expense incident to training or practice cruises of members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, but members of such corps denied such cruises in consequence hereof shall not be refused appointments as ensigns in the Naval Reserve by reason thereof: *Provided further*, That uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law may be furnished from surplus or reserve stocks of the Navy without payment from this appropriation, except for actual expenses incurred in the manufacture or issue: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount paid from this appropriation for uniforms, equipment, or material furnished to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps from stocks under the control of the Navy be in excess of the price current at the time the issue is made.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Page 15, line 1, strike out all the language after the word "Provided," down to and including line 6, and insert the following: "Any member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps denied the advance-course training cruise at the convenience of the Government shall not be refused appointment as ensign in the Naval Reserve by reason thereof."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, of course, if my amendment is subject to a point of order, then this proviso is subject to a point of order, because I have accepted half of the proviso as presented in the bill. The part I have stricken from the bill will be approved by the Navy Department, so that the reserve force shall not be completely crippled, and at the same time without increasing the appropriations for the Naval Reserve.

I hope the chairman of the committee will be fair with the House. I do not use that expression in any offensive way at all. The language which is carried in the amendment which I have offered is language that is in the bill which the gentleman has proposed; and if the language in the amendment is subject to a point of order, then the lan-

guage in the gentleman's bill is also subject to a point of order. I am merely aiming to perfect this legislation. I am sure the gentlemen will agree with me. There is \$90,085 carried for training, food, subsistence, maintenance, and all sorts of expense in connection with the Naval Reserve. That is shown on page 15—\$90,085. The language that I ask to be taken out of the proviso is this:

That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for any expense incident to training or practice cruises of members of the Naval Reserve.

Now, realizing that \$90,000 is carried in the bill, much of that \$90,000 in the past would go for mileage, for food, for pay, and various other things connected with the reserve training. Now, it is barely possible that if my amendment is carried and the amount—\$90,000—is left as it is, the department may still carry on its cruises. The cruises are the backbone of the reserve force. They may still carry on their summer cruises and make arrangements with the reservists to pay their own mileage, to pay for their own food, to accept, if need be, a reduction in pay.

In any event we will get the younger, the more agile, and the better subjects for the reserve force, who in time of emergency will build up into the officer personnel of the Regular Navy. There is nothing drastic about the amendment. I simply take out the proviso that is in the bill which says that no part of this \$90,000 shall be used for training cruises. If we are going to retain the reserve force, let us give them an opportunity to cruise, if they can, on the \$90,000 that is carried in the bill. If they can not maintain their cruises, if they can not put their cruises into effect with certain additional economies, then that will be too bad for the service; but at least the House should not limit the appropriation of \$90,000 for the reserve force by saying that no part of this money shall be used for training cruises.

I hope the House will go along with me on this. It will be approved by the Navy Department. It is something that the reserve force needs. It is something that will prove for the efficiency of the reserve force. It may give the younger men an opportunity to have cruises in the summer time if they are willing to pay their own food or mileage. Let the Navy Department have a little latitude at least and do not encumber the reserve force with the provision that is in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The subject of the gentleman's address, as announced a few minutes ago, was "give the Navy what it wants"?

Mr. BRITTEN. I said the Navy Department was in favor of this.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman said, "give the Navy what it wants." That is the gentleman's idea?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, in 1917, before we entered the war—

Mr. BRITTEN. The summer cruise is probably the greatest incentive to membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. If discontinued, the morale of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps will undoubtedly suffer. In the past the department has been put to expense on account of the cruise for mileage, food, and pay. The amount of the appropriation has been cut; but without this prohibition against the cruise, the department would still be able to offer a cruise to such students as might wish to take it without such reimbursement of mileage, food, or pay as the state of the appropriation might make desirable. It is believed that under these conditions a large number of the ex-juniors could be given the cruise.

Reserve naval officers can not be given proper training without experience on board ships at sea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved a point of order, and I now make the point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

I do not have the amendment before me, but I looked at it a moment ago. It repeats the last half of what is already in the text of this proviso. It omits the first half of the proviso. I call attention to the well-established rule that where language already in the text of a bill or already in the text of an amendment may have been subject to a point of order, an amendment to such language, which does not involve a new point of order or enlarge the objection involved in a point of order, is in order.

In this case this language is in the proviso:

Members of such corps—

Meaning the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps—
denied such cruises—

Meaning cruises such as are mentioned in the foregoing—
shall not be refused appointments as ensigns in the Naval Reserve by reason thereof.

For that language the gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which reads as follows:

Any member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps denied the advanced-course training cruise at the convenience of the Government shall not be refused appointment as ensign in the Naval Reserve by reason thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a few remarks to the Chair on the question. I frankly confess it is a matter that is not entirely clear in my own mind; but if the point of order is well taken, it is upon the assumption that in the first instance the committee having incorporated in the bill a provision that is itself legislation upon an appropriation bill and it is sought to strike that out entirely by the amendment proposed, whether or not as an original proposition the point of order would not be in the position of being laid against the original proposition, which in itself confessedly is not authorized by law. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment striking out the entire proviso. If he seeks to strike out the entire proviso and add additional language, the purpose of his motion would be to nullify the entire provision and then the gentleman would have to rely upon the proposition offered by himself, which, I think, is confessedly legislation on an appropriation bill. If the point of order is well taken, I think it must be based upon that assumption; and, in my opinion, unless there are precedents to support the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois in his initial statement, the point of order is clearly well taken.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, may I add this one word? I call attention to the fact that the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois does not strike out the whole proviso. It strikes out everything after the word "Provided" and inserts language in lieu of the matter so stricken out. So it is an amendment offered in lieu of language in the text.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order. The only instance where it has been held that an amendment that is subject to a point of order may be added to by another amendment that is subject to a point of order is where the original proposition is offered on the floor as an amendment to the bill. Then if the original proposition which is offered from the floor as an amendment to the bill is in itself subject to a point of order and there is no point of order made against it, then it has been held that a germane amendment can be added to it that would otherwise be subject to a point of order. But this is not an analogous case. This is a provision in the bill and it has passed the point-of-order stage. There was no point of order made against it. This is an attempt to strike it out and put something in the bill which is subject to a point of order, because it is legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULLER). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is in a little doubt about this proposition, but he is fortified by the opinion of the Parliamentarian. The first part of this clause is a limitation down to line 4 and the rest of it is clearly legislation, but no objection was made to it because it was legislation.

In a decision rendered by Speaker Cannon, found in section 8504 of Cannon's Precedents, it is stated:

A paragraph changing existing law, being permitted to remain by general consent, may be perfected by germane amendments which do not provide additional legislation.

This was concurred in by Chairman Garrett, of Tennessee. As the Chair stated, he was in a little bit of doubt; but being fortified by those opinions, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRITTEN) there were—ayes 39, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including care of grounds, \$100,000; services of a professor of international law, \$2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, \$2,000; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, including subscriptions to newspapers, \$5,000; for contingencies of the president of the Naval War College, to be expended in his discretion, not exceeding \$1,000; in all, \$110,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$73,000.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: Page 15, line 20, change \$100,000 to \$168,000; page 16, line 3, change \$110,000 to \$178,000 and add the following immediately thereafter: *Provided*, That if the training of recruits is continued at the naval training station at Newport and the said training station is not closed, the sum of \$68,000 from this appropriation is hereby made available for the maintenance of the naval training station, Newport, in addition to any other sums appropriated for the maintenance of said station.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the committee voted down an amendment to increase the appropriation for the training of recruits at Newport and gave as the reason that the Navy Department was considering closing training there and adding it to the War College. It is absolutely necessary to keep up this station and practically the amount that I have asked to be added to this appropriation for the War College is the lowest amount for which the station can be maintained. It is necessary to keep up the grounds whether training is conducted at the training station or not. The War College is on the same grounds with the same supply of heat and with the same pipes requiring the same amount of work, whether actual training is continued at that point or not.

Therefore, it seems to me if you are going to take the sum of \$83,000 from the amount that the Bureau of the Budget recommended for the Newport Naval Training Station, you should at least add the sum of \$68,000 to the appropriation for the War College in order that they may carry on, because, as I have said, the heat, light, or other similar work is done by the training station on the island, and all that work practically will have to be done if it is continued solely as a War College.

The amount estimated, therefore, is to keep up the station whether training goes on there or not, and the reason for this amendment, as I have said, is because the grounds, the sea walls, the roads, the walks, the pipe lines and the electrical supply are all necessary to be kept up so long as the War College is situated on this island.

I therefore hope the committee will see that this station, which even the Appropriations Committee acknowledges must be carried on for the benefit of the War College, has a sufficient amount allotted them to keep up the work.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion the point is well taken and sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the suggestion made by our good friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], that we ought to give the Navy everything it wants.

Just before we entered the war in 1917 we had 30 admirals. We have 59 to-day. We have approximately twice as many admirals to-day as we had when we entered the war. When we entered the war in 1917 we had 99 captains in the Navy, and to-day we have 242.

We have in Washington doing land service to-day nearly 500 naval officers. They are in each other's way. I wish you would go down to the Navy Department building and go in every room of that building at 10 o'clock in the morning or at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon and tell me how many high naval officers you find hard at work there. They will be talking over last night's dance, or reception, or bridge game, or golf, or polo, or horseback riding, or something that is not business.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield, always, to the big-navy man, who is naturally "wet."

Mr. BRITTEN. In addition to his remarks about the work of the naval officers in a particular department, will the gentleman tell me how many highly paid men there are in the Prohibition Bureau in this town who are wasting money every day?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I shall answer the gentleman. They are not idle. They are hard at work. They are doing good work. They caught nearly \$300,000 worth of liquor the other day. And they are now catching the big moguls.

Mr. BRITTEN. Where did that liquor go? Who got the liquor?

Mr. BLANTON. The Government takes it and confiscates it. They have taken in more property and more money in fines than they have paid out in expenses. That is a paying department of the Government; it is self-supporting. It is the only department of the Government that is paying its own way.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will say it is a paying job for the agents.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield further.

Since my friend from Illinois and my friend from New York are on the floor I want to take this opportunity to take my hat off to the brave Governor of California who has upheld the honor of the great Commonwealth of California. He has seen fit to consider upholding the law and the courts of California of more importance than yielding to outside influence exerted in behalf of a murderous dynamiter. He believes in looking at the record and evidence of a case and paying some attention to it and not trying cases on outside influence; and when it came to granting a pardon to a man who murderously had taken the lives of 10 innocent men, women, and little children with a bomb, he had the guts and the courage to stand up and uphold the law. Great is the Commonwealth of California, and great is Governor Rolph of that great State. [Applause.]

I have probably made a closer study of and know more about the official trial of Tom Mooney than any other Member in this House. At the time Hon. W. B. Wilson was Secretary of Labor, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, I introduced in the House, on June 20, 1919, a resolution known as H. Res. 128, which was referred to the Committee on Labor, which resolution directed the Secretary of Labor to promptly report to the House of Representatives, first, what connection John B. Densmore, then Director of the United States Employment Service, had with the case of Thomas J. Mooney, convicted in California, stating in detail the activities of said Densmore concerning said case, attaching copies of all reports concerning same made to the Department of Labor by said John B. Densmore, director; and second, what connection in behalf of the Department of Labor, since the

punishment of said Thomas J. Mooney was commuted to life imprisonment, has any employee of the Department of Labor had with said case of Thomas J. Mooney; and, third, what requests on the Department of Labor, if any, have been made by a grand jury or a court in California for said John B. Densmore, director, to appear in California to give evidence, and what action concerning same was taken by the Department of Labor.

The Committee on Labor gave me a prompt hearing and favorably reported my said resolution, House Resolution 128, on June 26, 1919, and it was referred to the House Calendar, and the then chairman of the Committee on Labor, Mr. Smith, of Michigan, filed the committee Report No. 75, and on June 27, 1919, my said resolution was duly passed by the House of Representatives.

Pursuant to the requirements of my said resolution, House Resolution 128, Hon. W. B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, transmitted to the House of Representatives his report on July 22, 1919, which embraced a report of 88 printed pages, made by said John B. Densmore, director, detailing how his paid assistants, paid with the money of the taxpayers of the United States, had burglarized the office of the district attorney, Charles M. Fickert, who had tried and convicted Mooney, and how they had secretly installed a dictaphone in this State official's office. This report was printed by the House of Representatives as House Document No. 157, first session Sixty-sixth Congress, and contains 90 printed pages.

I wish every Member of this Congress would get a copy of this House Document No. 157 and read it. You would then understand how in 1918 evidence was already being manufactured to free Mooney when he had been legally tried before an impartial jury of his peers and lawfully convicted in an orderly way of an heinous and dastardly crime.

In such connection, it should be remembered that it was during the Preparedness Day parade in San Francisco on July 22, 1916, that Thomas J. Mooney perpetrated his bomb outrage, throwing his deadly bomb among innocent people and killing 10 men, women, and little children who suffered horrible deaths, and seriously wounding a large number of others.

This report of Director John B. Densmore is disgusting and revolting to every American who believes in law and order. He had the audacity to report to a Cabinet officer of the United States of America, the Secretary of Labor, that—

His plan was to proceed secretly, with but two or three men, and make no move that would attract attention, either from the prosecution, the defense, or the corporate interests of the city of San Francisco.

Densmore further reported that he—

had at this time two trusted assistants in San Francisco, and to them I confided my plan of operations, leaving, however, the execution of the details very largely to their own judgment.

Densmore further reported that his assistants "had not been long at work before they unearthed evidence that convinced them that it was absolutely necessary to the success of the operation to install a dictaphone in the office of the district attorney, Mr. Charles M. Fickert."

And then it was most astounding when Densmore, a high official of the United States, confessed that he was a party to committing deliberate burglary when he reported:

This task was a seemingly impossible one, owing to the fact that Fickert keeps himself barricaded behind double-locked doors on the fourth floor of the Hall of Justice in a private office to which only one other man has the keys.

And then, apparently ashamed of disclosing just how he committed burglary and other crimes, Densmore reported:

The full details as to how this dictaphone was finally installed will probably never be divulged, as no good purpose could be served by a recital of the facts, interesting as they are. Some idea of the difficulties involved will be gained when it is stated that more than two months of careful and clever work were required before the installation was complete and the machine in actual operation.

It took Director Densmore that long to bribe the one other man who had keys to the district attorney's office.

Then I want you to note the minute description of the private office of the district attorney of California, which,

through committing heinous crimes, this United States official, Densmore, was able to enter secretly, for Densmore reported:

Fickert's office in the Hall of Justice is a very large room in the southwest corner of the building, on the topmost floor. (See diagram, Exhibit A.) It is lighted by two arched windows, one overlooking Portsmouth Square to the west, the other fronting Merchant Street on the south. The district attorney's desk is in the extreme southwest corner of the room, between the two windows. Besides the desk, the room contains a large oblong table; otherwise there is little furniture. On the floor and table, in picturesque disarray, are countless exhibits alleged to the activities of the I. W. W.'s, the Mooney defendants, and other reputed agitators and dynamiters.

You will note that it was this brave district attorney of the great Commonwealth of California who, in behalf of law and order and of good society, was bending his efforts to disrupt I. W. W.'s and dynamiters, and it was this interfering official of the United States Government who was out there, across the United States from Washington, burglarizing even the Hall of Justice in an attempt to manufacture evidence to free a murderous dynamiter.

Densmore further reported:

For dictaphone purposes the location was by no means an ideal one. Rumbling teams and street cars, tooting automobiles, the shouts of Chinese children playing around the Robert Louis Stevenson fountain in the park opposite—these and other sounds from Kearney Street ascended and mingled with the voices of those conversing within the room. The room itself was about 25 by 30 feet, and when conversations were held in a low voice at some distance from the transmitter the results attained were not always satisfactory.

I want to ask my colleagues here in this House if they have ever before heard of a more revolting and disgusting detail of how criminals worked to manufacture evidence.

Now, listen to this. Densmore further reported:

Considerable experiment was thus required to adjust the delicate microphone to the peculiar and baffling conditions. After trying out various combinations of batteries, resistance coils, amplifying valves, and receivers, and making several novel improvements never before attempted in similar lines of work, a final satisfactory adjustment was at last received.

And I want my colleagues here to read all of the ridiculous matter said Densmore reported—that for days he took over that dictaphone, as contained in his said report—none of any probative force, effect, or value whatever, and yet the Secretary of Labor reported to Congress that our Government paid to Densmore's said assistants the sum of \$6,101, and other expenses of \$1,043, used in committing crimes.

It was my investigation of these criminal activities of Director John B. Densmore on the Pacific coast that led me to discover that he had wasted and grafted several hundred thousand dollars, and the record will show that when he tried to get \$5,000,000 more out of the Treasury I fought and blocked it, and kept him from getting it.

After getting the Densmore report of his crimes committed in San Francisco, I then got the House of Representatives to pass my resolution, House Resolution 225, which required the Secretary of Labor to furnish other facts to Congress, and pursuant thereto Secretary W. B. Wilson, on August 28, 1919, transmitted his report embracing the information sought, and same was printed into House Document No. 209, first session Sixty-sixth Congress, and I want my colleagues to get same and read the astounding facts contained therein.

And while he was Secretary of Labor, at an annual convention of the American Federation of Labor at Atlantic City, Secretary W. B. Wilson and President Gompers sat on the platform with Mrs. Rena Mooney and passed sympathetic resolutions and helped to collect funds to fight for Mooney's pardon.

Since the American Federation of Labor has repudiated anarchy and anarchists and communists, and has broken away from William Z. Foster and Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman and that ilk, I had hoped that they would no longer defend a convicted bomb thrower, who killed and wounded his innocent victims by the score, without the semblance of an excuse except that he wanted to break up and interfere with a Preparedness Day parade.

Yet we find to-day reputable members of organized labor, and sympathizers even here in this Congress, who will still defend Mooney, and fight to have him pardoned, when all they know about his case is that money, Densmores, and other influences have tried to cast clouds upon his trial, and to impeach his conviction.

I have personally discussed the details of the case against Mooney with Hon. Charles M. Fickert, the district attorney in California who tried the case, who was familiar with every detail of the testimony, and who convicted Mooney before a fair and impartial jury, and he convinced me beyond peradventure of a doubt that Mooney was guilty, and was lawfully convicted.

Judge Matt I. Sullivan, former chief justice of the Supreme Court of California, who carefully reviewed Mooney's trial, certified that Mooney had been proven to be a dangerous radical, a coworker of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, and had been identified with the bomb planting that killed and injured so many people.

Four distinguished, brave, unbiased, impartial Governors of the great Commonwealth of California have now reviewed the conviction of Thomas J. Mooney, and in spite of every influence that could be brought to bear upon officials have decided that Mooney is guilty of a heinous crime, that he was lawfully tried, and legally convicted.

I did not intend to discuss the Mooney case when I arose. Now, I want to get back to these 59 admirals.

Mr. HARLAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question pertaining to the 59 admirals and directly on that point?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. The gentleman spoke of the great number of naval officers in Washington doing land duty.

Mr. BLANTON. Nearly 500 of them.

Mr. HARLAN. How are we going to maintain a naval establishment suitable for war conditions unless we maintain a corps of officers in some way?

Mr. BLANTON. The question has gone far enough for me to answer it. I shall answer the gentleman.

Mr. HARLAN. I would like to finish the question.

Mr. BLANTON. I will answer the question.

If we could conduct the Naval Establishment in 1917—and we had a pretty good one—with 30 admirals, who, after the commencement of the war, got our men across and helped win the war by stopping the German Kaiser and saving the civilization of the world—if we could do all that then with 30 admirals, why do we now need 59 admirals in peace time? And if in 1917 when we entered war we could do it with 99 captains, why do we now need 252 captains in the United States Navy in peace time?

If we could only cut off of the pay roll of the Government the admirals and other big Navy officers we do not need, and cut off the generals and other big Army officers we do not need, and cut off the chiefs and thousands of other bureau employees we do not need, we could then balance the Budget and get back to normalcy, and our Government and people would be much better off.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am gratified to say that I can agree to some extent with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on one proposition, namely, on the tremendous number of these useless admirals and captains that we are providing for.

But I can not agree with him in his defense of these prohibition admirals, generals, snoopers, snipers, and boozers for whom we appropriate, and are appropriating, these large sums of money, notwithstanding that we have had a deficit of nearly \$1,500,000,000. However, I am hopeful that some day the gentleman from Texas will realize and admit that his defense of these professional prohibitionists was undeserved.

Nor do I agree with the gentleman from Texas in his commendation of the Governor of the great State of California. I respect the people of California. I am acquainted with many of them, and I find in that great State some of the finest men and women in our country. However, I do

regret exceedingly that the Governor of California did not have the courage to do the righteous thing and pardon Mooney, a man who is innocently suffering for the misdeeds of others and a man who, as unbiased investigation disclosed and as Trial Judge Griffin and all of the jurors now admit, although they found him guilty at the time, was convicted on perjured testimony. I feel that if the gentleman from Texas, though he is prejudiced against labor, and especially organized labor, would investigate all of the disclosures in that case, particularly in regard to how Tom Mooney was "framed," I feel that he would be man enough to condemn, instead of commending, not only the governor but all of those responsible for the most glaring injustice ever perpetrated in the name of the law.

At this moment I have come into possession of statements which I feel should satisfy even the gentleman from Texas that Thomas J. Mooney not only should have been pardoned but should not have been convicted. Superior Court Judge Franklin Griffin, who presided at the Mooney trial, has this to say in regard to the decision of the Governor of California in denying Mooney a pardon:

A great disappointment. I firmly believe he is absolutely innocent.

Capt. Duncan Matheson, who directed the police case against Mooney, expresses himself as follows:

California has lost another opportunity to correct a miscarriage of justice.

William V. MacNevin, foreman of the jury that convicted Mooney, states:

I am sorry he was not freed.

I am hopeful that in the near future there will be a governor elected in that great State who shall have the courage to do what the great Gov. John P. Altgeld of my State did when he found that certain men were unjustly convicted of a crime which they never committed—pardon an innocent man.

In the State of California an election will soon be held, and I hope the honest citizens of that State will elect a man who will be courageous enough, strong enough, and just enough to do the righteous thing by Mooney, who has been convicted, as I have said, on perjured evidence and incarcerated unjustly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman to read the public document that I had printed years ago showing John B. Dinsmore's activities in spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of Government money in manufacturing testimony for Tom Mooney in Los Angeles.

Mr. SABATH. I can not yield further to the gentleman. I have read the evidence that he refers to; and if it was manufactured evidence, it was not in behalf of Mooney but in behalf of the State. This much was admitted by the witnesses who were made to offer the perjured testimony which convicted Mooney, to the everlasting shame to the State of California.

Now, as to the Navy, we read every day and we hear on the floor of this House that we are starving the Navy, and that we are starving the Army. I am the last person who wants to see the Navy or the Army starved. I know we are starving 8,000,000 American citizens who are unable to find employment.

When I entered this House 25 years ago we appropriated \$94,000,000 for the Navy. Last year we appropriated \$360,101,593, an increase in appropriations of almost 400 per cent in a quarter of a century.

And for the information of the House and for those who continually cry and deplore that we are starving the Nation, I shall take the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the figures showing the great increase that has taken place in the Navy as well as the Army appropriations since the be-

ginning of my incumbency in the House. These are not my figures, but have been prepared for me by the director of the Library of Congress, and are therefore correct:

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Grand total, all appropriations	War Department		Navy Department		Pensions, Interior Department
		Total	Military Establishment	Total	Naval Establishment	
1908 ¹	\$710,287,626	\$182,106,207	\$78,883,990	\$102,886,052	\$94,471,571	\$146,143,000
1909 ²	832,629,393	193,328,116	95,160,659	133,160,401	112,977,353	163,053,000
1910 ³	835,593,379	208,946,483	101,262,070	143,122,757	130,137,432	160,908,000
1911 ⁴	805,294,513	213,205,301	96,141,285	136,061,340	121,880,212	155,758,000
1912 ⁵	767,218,485	199,747,922	93,412,231	130,610,218	117,881,032	153,686,500
1913 ⁶	751,377,207	193,930,943	91,830,532	126,807,323	118,539,339	164,725,000
1914 ⁷	788,864,599	191,950,494	95,185,668	143,490,119	136,369,490	180,300,000
1931 ⁸	4,242,870,150	464,350,935	346,655,079	400,008,101	(9)	-----
1932 ⁹	3,995,026,535	460,078,650	334,781,865	360,101,593	(9)	-----

Veterans' Administration, total.....\$921,392,349
 Army and Navy pensions.....232,000,000
 Adjusted-service certificate fund.....112,000,000

¹ Estimates of appropriations, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1909. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907. Pp. 564-566. Includes deficiencies, miscellaneous, and permanent annual appropriations.

² Ibid. for 1910, pp. 608-609. Includes deficiencies, miscellaneous, and permanent annual.

³ Ibid. for 1911, pp. 557-558. Includes deficiencies, miscellaneous, and permanent annual, but excludes Postal Service payable from postal revenues.

⁴ Ibid. for 1912, pp. 500-502. Includes deficiencies, miscellaneous, and permanent annual, but excludes Postal Service payable from postal revenues.

⁵ Ibid. for 1913, pp. 541-543. Includes deficiencies, miscellaneous, and permanent annual, but excludes Postal Service payable from postal revenues.

⁶ Ibid. for 1914, pp. 807-809. Includes deficiencies, miscellaneous, and permanent annual, but excludes Postal Service payable from postal revenues.

⁷ Ibid. for 1915, pp. 743-745. All appropriations made during the Sixty-second Congress, third session, and Sixty-third Congress, first session, for 1914 (exclusive of Postal Service); but not including deficiencies for prior years, amounting to \$30,537,275.

⁸ The Budget for 1933, totals as given on p. A-177; Military Establishment, p. A-115; details for Veterans' Administration, p. A-27.

⁹ Separate figures for total Naval Establishment not given.

The above figures should forever silence the professional Navy and Army propagandists and lobbyists that Congress is not fair to the Navy or the Army.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am absolutely certain that, if a real survey were taken, we would find that we could easily eliminate not only 10 but 20 per cent of the appropriations for the Army and Navy, and that without affecting or impairing in any way the efficiency of either. And I feel, therefore, that the remarks which have been made that we are starving the Navy are unfair and unjust. [Applause.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BURDICK: Page 15, line 20, change "\$100,000" to read "\$168,000," and on page 16, line 3, change "\$110,000" to read "\$178,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURDICK) there were—ayes 16, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I hope that after this 5-minute speech there will be no more speaking out of order. We want to finish this bill this afternoon, else we shall have to have a session tomorrow.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I shall not feel offended if the gentleman from Kansas objects. He is quite within his rights when he objects to time being used on subjects not related to the bill, and I sympathize with him in his efforts to expedite consideration of the bill. I would not have asked to speak out of order were it not for the unfortunate statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in reference to the Mooney case. I can not permit the record to remain unchallenged as to the conclusions reached by the gentleman from Texas and inserted into the RECORD a few moments ago. No fair-minded man, none with

the slightest knowledge of law, can read the record in the Mooney case without becoming indignant and ashamed of such administration of justice.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I decline to yield. Every responsible man who was connected with that trial who has learned since the trial of the perjury committed, of the framed witnesses brought there to testify, has expressed his regret for his action in connection with that trial. The judge himself said it was the dirtiest day's work in his life. Every living juror has signed a statement that had he known that the testimony was perjured and framed he would not have brought in a verdict of guilty. Only recently the Wickersham Committee, which the gentleman from Texas himself praised for the great ability of its members and the great confidence he had in its membership, caused an investigation of that case to be made, and the findings of the trained investigators were so repulsive, so repugnant, it so exposed the indecency of that trial to such an extent, that for some unknown reason or for some mysterious reason the report was suppressed. The Senate committee succeeded in obtaining the report, and if the gentleman from Texas will take the pains he can get that report to the Wickersham Committee.

I am sure that instead of taking the floor and glorifying the continued incarceration of an American citizen who has been proved to be innocent, after reading it he will hang his head in shame at the conduct, surroundings, and perjury of that trial.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be fair enough to yield to me now?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. On that ground I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is talking about a record that has been fixed up since the trial by somebody else. I have been talking about, and the Governor of California has passed on, the official record of the trial itself, which four distinguished governors of California have held showed a lawful conviction.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman refers to a record that has been fixed up, I say yes, the record in the Mooney case was fixed, was perjured, and stands there as a blot on American justice. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance: For water rent, heating, and lighting; cemetery, burial expenses, and headstones; general care and improvements of grounds, buildings, walls, and fences; repairs to power-plant equipment, implements, tools, and furniture, and purchase of the same; music in chapel and entertainments for beneficiaries; stationery, books, and periodicals; transportation of indigent and destitute beneficiaries to the Naval Home, and of sick and insane beneficiaries, their attendants and necessary subsistence for both, to and from other Government hospitals; employment of such beneficiaries in and about the Naval Home as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, on the recommendation of the governor; support of beneficiaries and all other contingent expenses, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of two motor-propelled vehicles, and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes, \$93,475.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I did not intend to speak on this bill, but I am wondering what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would have defend this Nation in time of another war. He wants to increase the river of unemployment by adding to the great many already unemployed many of the officers and enlisted personnel of our Navy, where active service should be continued in order to maintain an adequate defense. He cited the personnel which we had in the Navy prior to the World War, and I suggest to my friend from Texas that perhaps in a future war, where the very destiny of the Nation and the lives and homes of our people are involved, we might not be fortunate enough to have allies carrying the burden of the war for many months until we were able to train officers to command and lead the legions of American manhood as in the case of the World War.

I suppose if another great catastrophe came upon our Nation and her people that the gentleman from Texas would rely upon the naval experts in the prohibition-enforcement part of the Coast Guard Service, who have been trained in

chasing rum runners, bootleggers, and hijackers. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] look into the stupendous increase in the cost of maintaining the Coast Guard by reason of its prohibition-enforcement activities, if they want to make a real study from the economy standpoint. I suppose that the gentleman from Texas, in time of national emergency, would also have the Army-officer personnel recruited from the shotgun experts of the Prohibition Unit, which unit is costing the taxpayers many millions of dollars each year. The gentleman from Texas favors this extraordinary large expense in the name of law enforcement. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments recently had hearings, which developed that the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, was charged with the enforcement of a multitude of criminal laws.

This bureau is charged with enforcing the Mann White Slave Act, the national motor vehicle theft act, the national bankruptcy act, the national bank and Federal reserve act, all frauds perpetrated against the Government, antitrust prosecutions, thefts from interstate shipments, all crimes committed on Government reservations and the high seas, bribery and corruption of Government officials, and impersonations. These are some of the major violations. There are many smaller violations. They also apprehend all fugitives from justice, whether they have been convicted by another governmental agency or not. They also perform investigative functions for the State Department and other departments of the Government. They also investigate applications for appointment as Federal judges, United States attorneys, United States marshals, and other important officers.

The total personnel of this bureau is now only 820; the total appropriation for the fiscal year 1932 is only \$2,978,520, and there are now over 1,100 cases on record for investigation which have not been assigned.

On the other hand, a total personnel of 12,443 and a total expenditure of \$40,043,313.50 from the Federal Treasury is provided for the same fiscal year to enforce the one sacred prohibition law.

The breakdown is as follows:

Bureau of Industrial Alcohol, personnel 1,718; expenditure.....	\$4,814,420.00
Prohibition Bureau, personnel 3,380; expenditure....	11,369,500.00
Increase in Coast Guard since that branch of the Government has been charged with prohibition enforcement, personnel 7,345, expenditure.....	23,859,393.50

From the law-enforcement standpoint, as viewed and expressed by the gentleman from Texas, I believe he thinks it is more important to catch a poor widow selling a glass of home-brew containing 2½ per cent of alcohol, in order to support her children, and send her to jail for five years under the nefarious Jones law than it is to catch a white slaver or a murderer on an Indian reservation, or a public official who robbed the Nation of Teapot Dome—Mr. Fall, a Republican, who conspired with Mr. Doheny, that sterling Democrat.

When you talk about law enforcement, come down to bedrock and do not demagogue and try to fool the American people. I wonder if the Committee on Appropriations, led by the economy expert, the chairman of the committee [Mr. BYRNS], really believes this is the correct Navy appropriation bill. It is unfair for the taxpayers of this Nation and the Members of this House and the other body to be made pawns in a fake economy battle of Tennessee, from "BYRNS to McKELLAR to BYRNS to McKELLAR."

After careful consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, Mr. BYRNS's committee recommended—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING ENGINEERING

For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewals of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for anti-aircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service; equipment, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations, accident prevention, pay of classified field force under the bureau; incidental expenses for naval vessels, navy yards, and stations, inspectors' offices, the engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; services, instruments, machines and auxiliaries, apparatus, and supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work; maintenance and equipment of buildings and grounds at the engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md.; payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed; in all, \$18,030,000, of which \$250,000 shall be available exclusively for the procurement and installation of new tools and machinery for shops under the cognizance of the Bureau of Engineering and Construction and Repair, and \$90,000 shall be available exclusively to continue in effect for an additional period of 18 months the license agreement entered into by the Navy Department, May 2, 1931, for the use of certain inventions pertaining to radio control: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the schedule of wages for civil employees in the field service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,850,000.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this bill is perfect as reported by his committee from the standpoint of economy and efficiency? If a distinguished Member of another body makes a motion to strike 10 per cent from the total appropriations recommended by the committee and the Senate agrees to the reduction, will the House be called upon, under suspension of the rules, to cut 10 per cent, no matter where it hits, and without any information or consideration of the appropriations involved, as in the case of the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman is directing his question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and not to the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. SCHAFER. I am directing my question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I will repeat it. The Committee on Appropriations held extensive hearings on this bill. It was reported to the House of Representatives by the Appropriations Committee, which is the agent of the House. The Interior Department appropriation bill, containing certain appropriations, with a certain total, was also reported by the Appropriations Committee. Following the recommendation of its agent, the Committee on Appropriations, the House very carefully considered the bill under the 5-minute rule and passed the bill and sent it to the Senate. Then the other body arbitrarily reduced the total of the bill 10 per cent and, I believe, incorporated some 186 amendments which increased, decreased, eliminated, or added certain appropriations. This House was again called upon by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee after the bill came back to swallow every one of the amendments under suspension of the rules, with only 40 minutes' debate. We were told we must accept the bill with all its amendments in order to make the bill perfect from an economy standpoint.

I wonder whether the bill now being considered by the House is the real economy opinion of the Committee on Appropriations, or should the gentleman from Tennessee at the other end of the Capitol make another reduction of 10 per cent of the total, whether the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives will come to the House and say, "We were all wrong when we recommended the amounts reported in this bill," the same as they did in the case of the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I think the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] is chairman, has performed a splendid service in the preparation and reporting of this bill. I think they have done a real service to the people and to the Treasury. They have made every reduction they thought possible, consistent with national defense. Too much praise can not be given them for that. Now, I am not responsible, and neither is the gentleman, for what the body at the other end of the Capitol may do. The gentleman says that a certain Senator is performing this job over there, but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that while the Senator may have made the motion to cut these appropriation bills 10 per cent, it is the action of the entire Senate body. I, for one, believing in economy, believing in making every reduction possible, have made up my mind, so far as I am personally concerned, to accept every reduction they make in any of these bills [applause] and leave the responsibility with them as to whether it is sufficient to carry on the activities of the Government.

Mr. SCHAFER. That is a remarkable statement coming from the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, a committee which is the agent of this House. After careful and lengthy hearings and consideration they recommend to this House certain appropriation bills, and they say they have cut to the bone, and then, because another body arbitrarily cuts 10 per cent of the total, without realizing what activity of the Government is being crippled, we are told that we should swallow every amendment adopted by the other body. If that policy is to be followed, then in the name of economy we should make provision for the House of Representatives to dissolve and let the Senate legislate. I ask the Members of the House not to forget, if the Appropriations Committee does, that under the Constitution of the United States we have certain duties and responsibilities. If the Committee on Appropriations is going to follow that policy of betraying the House of Representatives whom they represent, and make it a cat's-paw and rubber stamp for the Senate, I call upon the alleged economy members of the Appropriations Committee to resign, so that we can have an Appropriations Committee that will not lead the House to slaughter because of a few political economy peddlers at the other end of the Capitol. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

PERSONNEL

Pay of naval personnel: For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders (not to exceed, exclusive of officers designated pursuant to law as additional numbers, 5,499 commissioned officers of the line, 908 officers of the Medical Corps, 186 officers of the Dental Corps, 556 officers of the Supply Corps, 83 officers of the Chaplain Corps, 233 officers of the Construction Corps, 109 officers of the Civil Engineer Corps, and 1,461 warrant and commissioned warrant officers), pay—\$30,646,680; rental allowance, \$6,098,515; subsistence allowance, \$3,705,180; in all, \$40,450,375; officers on the retired list, \$5,800,410; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$3,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$4,419,910; extra pay to men reenlisting after being honorably discharged, \$2,480,225; interest on deposits by men, \$3,000; pay of petty officers (not to exceed 5,910 chief petty officers and 850 chief petty officers under

acting appointment), seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, extra pay for men for diving, and cash prizes (not to exceed \$71,500) for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, and engineering competitions, \$63,729,756, and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to make transfers during the fiscal year 1933 from the clothing and small-stores fund to this appropriation of sums aggregating not to exceed \$2,750,000; outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment at not to exceed \$100 each, civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct or undesirability or inaptitude, reimbursement in kind of clothing to persons in the Navy for losses in cases of marine or aircraft disasters or in the operation of water or air borne craft, and the authorized issue of clothing and equipment to the members of the Nurse Corps, \$1,409,449; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$134,596, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, \$990,420; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors—pay \$613,900, rental allowance \$35,520, subsistence allowance \$19,272; pay retired list \$47,641; in all, \$716,333; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps; pay and allowances of transferred and assigned men of the Fleet Naval Reserve, \$10,451,941; reimbursement for losses of property as provided in the act approved October 6, 1917 (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 981, 982), as amended by the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 983), \$5,000; payment of six months' death gratuity, \$150,000; in all, \$130,744,415, and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers on the retired list: *Provided*, That hereafter additional pay for making aerial flights or for duty on board a submarine of the Navy shall in no case be at a rate in excess of \$1,100 per annum and \$720 per annum, respectively: *Provided further*, That hereafter no enlisted man of the Navy shall be assigned to the Fleet Naval Reserve as provided for in section 22 of the act of February 28, 1925 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 783): *Provided further*, That the total number of enlisted men in the ratings of bandmaster, first musician, musician first class, and musician second class on April 18, 1932, shall be reduced by 355 by discontinuing new enlistments and reenlistments not continuous in such ratings and/or placing in such ratings men otherwise rated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSS. I make a point of order on the second proviso, beginning with the words "Provided further," in line 15, to and including line 19, just before the next proviso.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. GOSS. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I make an additional point of order on next to the last proviso, commencing in line 19 and including the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. GOSS. For the same reason?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 1094 of Cannon's Precedents, under the chairmanship of Hon. John A. Buchanan, of Virginia, the ruling was made and later cited and approved by Hon. William L. Wilson, of West Virginia, that on an amendment offered—

"*Provided*, That no further contract shall be entered into by the Postmaster General under said act."

A point of order on the amendment having been raised by Mr. Dingley, the chairman held—

"The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois changes existing law, because it repeals the power conferred upon the Postmaster General by the first section of the act of March 3, 1891. As an amendment to an appropriation bill it must be germane to the subject matter and must retrench expenditures in one or more of the methods pointed out in the rule. The Chair is of the opinion that it does not do this unless by inference, and therefore is not in order."

Now, Mr. Chairman, reference is made in this proviso to title 34, section 783, of the United States Code, which states:

"That the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion and under such regulations," etc., "may require any person when first enlisting in the regular naval service and may authorize any enlisted man in such service to pledge himself to serve for four years in the Fleet Naval Reserve upon termination of enlistment in the regular naval service."

The proviso in the bill before us reads:

That hereafter no enlisted man of the Navy shall be assigned to the Fleet Naval Reserve.

It does not refer to a regular enlisted man or to an enlisted man of the regular Navy. I claim that it can not come under the Holman rule, because there is no proven saving to the country covered in this section. It is, therefore, not a limitation. Further, it has the tendency of repealing title 34, section 783, of the United States Code, which is at present existing law; and, repeating the chairman's opinion:

The Chair is of the opinion that it does not do this unless by inference, and therefore is not in order.

And further, it does repeal, or have the effect of repealing that whole existing law.

And if you follow it down further—I refer to page 31 of the report that refers to this section, and over on page 32, section 4—it states:

Enlisted men of the regular naval service assigned to the Fleet Naval Reserve in accordance with the provisions of this section, or enlisted men who within three months from date of discharge from the regular naval service upon completion of a four or six year enlistment, enlist in the Naval Reserve may, while so in the Naval Reserve, be permitted to reenlist in the regular naval service, in which case they shall be entitled to the same benefits as if they had enlisted in the regular naval service within three months of their last discharge therefrom.

Therefore there is no way to tell whether this would come under the Holman rule as a limitation, because no one knows when those enlistments or reenlistments expired or started.

Further, the existing law refers to the regular naval service, while in the bill it refers to enlisted men only.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to supplement the statement made by the gentleman from Connecticut. Ordinarily the Holman rule is invoked as an exception to the general rules of the House when it is applicable to and operates as a limitation on an appropriation in the bill for that year only. It comes in like a camel's head under a tent for the purpose of limiting the specific appropriation in connection with which it is offered. This objectionable feature is not in the form in which the Holman rule has been sustained so many times. This is a bald, open, and deliberate undertaking to change the general law on the subject, not with relation to the dollars that are herein appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year but for all time to come, until Congress again by some legislative enactment may change it. That is a far different thing from the usual case in which the Holman rule has been invoked and has been sustained.

It is provided in line 12:

That hereafter—

Which means for all time to come. Here is permanent legislative enactment by the Appropriations Committee and not a mere limitation upon an appropriation for this year. The same evil is found in line 16. If countenanced, this will break down all distinction between legislative committees and the Appropriations Committee, and hereafter appropriation bills may contain any declaration of public policy or substantive law which that committee sees fit to put in them.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I had not quite completed my thought. I desire to refer the Chair to page 1094 of Cannon's Precedents, where this language is found:

Provided, That no further contract shall be entered into by the Postmaster General under said act.

I claim that the contracts referred to in this particular bill are entered into by the Secretary of the Navy, and I respectfully refer the Chair to that part of the section—that is, title 34, section 783—where it starts out by saying the Secretary of the Navy, in the place of the Postmaster General, as was under discussion at the time of the former Chairman's ruling. In my opinion, it clearly comes under that ruling.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, recent decisions of the Chair construing the scope of the Holman rule have gone

pretty far afield. Those decisions are so broad that they are virtually supererogating to the Appropriations Committee legislative authority, which the Holman rule never intended to give to the Appropriations Committee or any Member on the floor.

Let us construe just what the Holman rule does, because there is before the Chair now the question as to whether there shall be any limit at all on the power of the Appropriations Committee or of any Member of this House in seeking to change existing law that squints at economy or whose ulterior purpose or manifest purpose is economy.

What are the three proposals that may be considered under the Holman rule, as written in clause 2 of Rule XXI? There are three proposals and three proposals only.

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter—

It first has to be germane—

except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States—

This certainly does not come within that category—

by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States—

Certainly this amendment does not come within that classification—

or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

There is nothing on the face of this amendment that shows that it comes within the last classification.

These are only three classes on which the Appropriations Committee or a Member of this House may justify an amendment counter to the general rules of the House.

Now, going to the proviso, the Committee on Appropriations is not a legislative committee and it does not come within that proviso.

I direct the Chair's attention to what is covered in the proviso:

Provided, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law.

The Appropriations Committee has no legislative power. It is not authorized by law to change existing law. That rests with the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment.

Certainly that is not the proposal here, because there is no commission making a definitive proposal for the changing of substantive law which results in the reduction of expenditures.

Which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, here we have the broadest kind of legislative authority being attempted by the Appropriations Committee. What is it? It says:

That hereafter—

Not alone so far as the appropriations as carried in this bill are concerned but for all time the Appropriations Committee is seeking to take unto itself the powers of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

That hereafter no enlisted man of the Navy shall be assigned to the Fleet Naval Reserve as provided for in section 22 of the act of February 28, 1925.

Certainly, if it were not for the Holman rule the Chair would unhesitatingly rule that this was legislation on an appropriation bill, because it interferes directly with existing law which gives the Secretary of the Navy full power and direction so far as the enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve are concerned.

In view of the three designated classes which the Committee on Appropriations must show to bring it within the Holman rule there is, in my opinion, with all due respect to the great Committee on Appropriations, no authority whatsoever that will justify the great power which is sought in

this instance, namely, of supererogating to itself the legislative power of the Congress where naval affairs are concerned.

Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. LA GUARDIA rose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard very briefly on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] want to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There are two points of order and I would like to be heard on the one that I have submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is considering the points of order together, as they both involve the same point.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard following the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer to hear first the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the point of order I made to the last proviso, there is not even the semblance or the color of any economy or retrenchment, and the Chair can not infer, even by the remotest stretch of the imagination, any economy there. Why? It simply provides and legislates against any new enlistments. It does not reduce the number now in the service. It does not attempt to discharge any musicians now in the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order was directed to the last proviso that provides for a reduction of 355.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But it does no such thing, as a matter of fact. It does not discharge a single man. It simply provides against any new enlistment, but every member now in the service may reenlist, and therefore it is purely legislation and nothing else. In fact, it is a mere declaration of policy. It has not even the color of economy. The amendment does not provide for the discharge of any given number of men. As the amendment now stands it suggests to the Secretary of the Navy that some time in the future in the case of a decrease in the number of musicians by death or otherwise, some time in the distant future because present personnel are entitled to reenlist, no new men should be enlisted. Surely this proposed legislation can not be brought within the requirements of the Holman rule. Further argument is unnecessary if the rules and precedents are to be followed by the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall make a very brief statement of my views on the point of order as to both of these provisos.

I think we should frankly concede for the purpose of this argument that both of these provisos do, as a matter of fact, constitute legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The only justification for their insertion and the only ground that is left for a vote by the Committee of the Whole on these two provisos is with respect to whether or not they come within the provisions of the Holman rule.

There is no dispute as to the citations offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] or the interpretation of the rule as cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. STAFFORD. I think we are all pretty familiar with the general principles involved in interpretation of the Holman rule. The Chair can not, by inference, read into a provision any imaginative economy, but it must be apparent to the Chair upon the face of the provision itself that it does, as a matter of language and as a matter of direct interpretation, come within one of the three exceptions set out in the Holman rule.

With this premise I want to read into the RECORD the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] with reference to the status of these men that are involved in the first proviso that is assailed:

We have a class of reservists, composed of what are termed "assigned" men. Assigned men are former enlisted men who, for a consideration of \$25 per annum, obligate themselves to serve in the Navy or Marine Corps in the event of war occurring within four years from the date of expiration of their enlistment. You will find the law on the subject in full on pages 31 and 32 of the report.

I think the gentleman from Connecticut cited that provision of law in his argument, so it will not be necessary to restate it.

The sole question here is raised in view of this law which has been cited and which, perhaps, I should restate:

The Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may require any person when first enlisting in the regular naval service, and may authorize any enlisted man in the service to obligate himself to serve four years in the Fleet Naval Reserve upon termination of his enlistment in the regular naval service.

This was an authorization under which the Secretary of the Navy could enlist these men. Under this proviso it is stated that hereafter no enlisted man of the Navy shall be assigned to the Fleet Naval Reserve as provided for in section 22 of the act of February 28, 1925, which is the act I have just cited. So the sole question before the Chair, as I understand it, is whether or not this prohibition set-up in this proviso does, as a matter of direct interpretation, reduce the expenditures out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BACON. How does the gentleman interpret the word "hereafter"?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For the purpose of a proper interpretation of the Holman rule, I do not think that makes any difference. The question, as I understand it, is not necessarily confined to a reduction in the immediate bill. I think sufficiently wide scope may be given to it to make it permanent law, although as to that I may be in error. Nevertheless, that is not the decisive question for the Chair here to decide, and my interpretation of the proviso is that it necessarily follows that if any enlisted man can be enlisted, under the terms of the law I have just read, the necessary inference is that when you cut off or prohibit enlistments that are now authorized, you thereby reduce the expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has carefully examined the language to which the point of order has been directed. The Chair thinks that his decision on this point of order should be governed by the last sentence of clause 2 of Rule XXI, which provides:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States by the reduction in compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

That provision of the rule which the Chair has just read permits legislation on an appropriation bill provided it comes within one of the excepted classes just enumerated. The Chair thinks that the language to which the point of order has been made is germane to the bill under consideration. The Chair also thinks that the language reduces expenditures in at least two of the ways provided by the rule. The Chair is of the opinion that all of the language to which the point of order has been made is necessary to bring about the reduction sought. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. AYRES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 8, strike out the figures "\$30,640,680" and insert "\$30,653,486, including not to exceed \$1,014,250 for increase pay for making aerial flights."

Mr. AYRES. That is in accordance with the agreement this morning. I am going to offer another amendment in relation to submariners.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I want to offer to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TABER to the committee amendment: Page 23, line 8, after the word "pay," strike out "\$30,653,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,242,680."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I expect to follow later with the amendment that I stated when we were under general debate.

This amendment is designed to reduce the pay to officers by \$400,000, and I expect to follow this by an amendment at the end of page 25, which will prohibit constructive com-

mission services, so that the officer shall be entitled only to actual commission services.

My idea in offering this amendment is that there are a number of officers in the Army and in the Navy who, by reason of constructive service, are being paid large amounts of money which are not justified by the service they perform. They are being paid these sums because of some constructive service as an enlisted man or in the National Guard out of all proportion to the rank they occupy. For instance, there was the case of a certain admiral in China, and the pay of a lieutenant serving under him was greater than that of the admiral. These payments are out of all proportion.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There seems to be some confusion here. The gentleman from Kansas offered an amendment. Does the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York go over the figures of the gentleman from Kansas or under?

Mr. TABER. Under.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Did the subcommittee have any hearings on the proposition?

Mr. TABER. Simply as to the amount, the figures.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Then you had no real hearings?

Mr. TABER. No; not going into this in detail.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. And the subcommittee really never considered it?

Mr. TABER. No; they did not. It was brought up in the full committee, and I brought it up on the floor. I tried to bring it up at different times, but the others refused to consider it, not because they did not recognize its merits, I think, but for some other reason.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in order to simplify the matter so that the House can consider it separately why not let the committee amendment be first adopted, and then have the gentleman offer his amendment, which will raise, as he knows, a very controversial question?

Mr. TABER. The reason is that under the rules I can not offer the amendment later.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The gentleman could ask unanimous consent, so that we may have the two matters put to us separately.

Mr. TABER. The committee can act upon my amendment and then can act upon the committee amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this question. There is this danger, that if this amount is cut now, it will destroy the purpose that the gentleman from Kansas has in offering an amendment to maintain the flight pay. I am sure the gentleman does not want to confuse the issue to that extent.

Mr. TABER. I do not want to confuse any issue; I want it clear. Does this amendment of the gentleman from Kansas raise this sum?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Yes; it raises the figure now carried in the bill.

Mr. TILSON. What assurance has the gentleman that this deduction will be made from the sum he says it will? It is a lump sum; and why could not the reduction be subtracted from some other portion of the expense?

Mr. TABER. It should come out of this particular item, because this is the item out of which these people are paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 25, lines 12 to 16, inclusive, strike out the following:

"Provided, That hereafter additional pay for making aerial flights or for duty on board a submarine of the Navy shall in no

case be at a rate in excess of \$1,100 per annum and \$720 per annum, respectively: *Provided further.*"

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, that is in accordance with the announcement I made this morning.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The purpose of the amendment is to strike out the reduction of the flight pay?

Mr. AYRES. The limitation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then the flight pay stands as it does now?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That means the existing law as it is as to flight pay?

Mr. AYRES. That is correct.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. AYRES. I hope the gentleman will not take any more time out of order.

Mr. SCHAFER. I do not intend to discuss politics, as I want to call to the attention of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Economy Committee certain conditions existing with reference to the Navy officer personnel from the standpoint of economy. I shall not take the five minutes if the gentleman will be patient.

I suggest that the members of the Naval Affairs Appropriation Subcommittee, the members of the Naval Affairs Legislative Committee, and the members of the Economy Committee look into an absolute waste of the taxpayers' money in so far as expenditures in the Navy Department are concerned. We have a situation in the Navy Department today which is becoming very expensive to the Treasury, because of a shortage in the number of vacancies in the higher-officer-personnel grades. The taxpayers of the Nation have been training midshipmen at Annapolis at a cost of about \$16,000 each. Under the existing method of promotion in the higher-officer ranks we have a number of admirals sitting in star-chamber proceedings—a so-called selection board—plucking them up and plucking them down. This plucking board considers the records and ability of the officers, not in the rank to which they seek promotion but the recommendations of superior officers as to how they performed the duties assigned to their lower rank prior to the promotion.

It is a star-chamber proceeding without records being kept. These admirals on the plucking board choose, for instance, in the case of lieutenant commanders, which ones are to be selected for promotion on their record and, on the other hand, designate those who should not be promoted. And then all of these lieutenant commanders who have not been selected for promotion and who are in the prime of life and who have been educated at the Naval Academy at a cost of \$16,000 to the taxpayers, after having 21 years service, are placed on the retired list to draw on the average \$3,000 per year as long as they live without rendering any service. I want to suggest that if you want economy in the Navy look into this fraud on the taxpayers and bring legislation before the House which will cure this indefensible extravagance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "subsistence," in line 9, on page 23, may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment for the purpose of having the Clerk read in my time a telegram just received from Capt. Eddie V. Rickenbacker, American ace of the World War. It has to do with the gentleman's amendment, which is now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the telegram, as requested.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 22, 1932.

Congressman FRED A. BRITTEN,

House of Representatives:

May I enlist your sincere support in opposing the elimination of flying pay for Army, Navy, and Marine Corps pilots? My years of experience and close association with the members of these branches of our defensive arms recommend the maintenance of the high standard which has been developed as a guaranty that we may never again be confronted with the usual problems which faced us during the World War. It is my genuine belief—and I speak for a great many of my former comrades of the air—that not only is the elimination of flying pay false economy but would destroy the desire and ambition of our present service pilots, and would also work a definite hardship financially on them, as the individual expense brought about by the very spirit that exists to-day among our flying personnel makes it inadvisable. It is essential that this high standard and spirit be maintained in order that these branches of our national defense may continue as years go on to attract the quality of youth and intelligence which, in my estimation, is second to none throughout the world. The limited number of fatalities in the face of the tremendous hazards among the different branches of our Air Service during the past year is indicative of the qualities mentioned above, which should be maintained regardless of cost. The great majority of commercial pilots flying throughout the United States with our mail and passengers, both day and night, are graduates of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps flying schools. Again, proof that the necessity of the above is emphasized in the fact that America can to-day boast of the finest combination of commercial and transportation systems by air that exist anywhere in the world, which is the second line of our aerial defense in peace time, and from which would be recruited in time of national emergency the great majority of highly skilled technicians, administrative, and flying personnel. Implore you and every other Member of the House of Representatives to guard this spirit jealously in honor of that great body of pioneers of the air, both in peace and in war, who gave their all in the springtime of their lives that this generation and those yet unborn may be privileged to enjoy the peace and happiness we all so fervently desire. Certainly the very conditions which are to-day demanding the utmost effort in the interests of economy on the part of our representatives also demand judgment in bringing about these economies that are the result of calm deliberate reflection rather than hysteria.

CAPT. E. V. RICKENBACKER.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I desire to say that there are a certain number of officers and enlisted men (besides pilots) whose duty in connection with aviation requires them to make regular and frequent flights in aircraft. The number that can be so detailed is restricted by certain laws enacted by Congress, and the following are quoted:

[From an act, Public, No. 35, 67th Cong. (H. R. 4803)]

There shall be a chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the officers of the active list of the Navy or Marine Corps who shall within one year after his appointment qualify as an aircraft pilot or observer, . . .

Provided, That not to exceed 30 per cent of the officers in each grade below that of rear admiral who fail to qualify as aircraft pilots or as aircraft observers within one year after the date of their detail into the Bureau of Aeronautics shall be permitted to remain detailed in this bureau: *Provided further*, That flying units or detachments, with the exception of aircraft carriers or other vessels, shall in all cases be commanded by flying officers.

[From air program act, June 24, 1926, sec. 3, par. 5]

Line officers detailed to command of aircraft carriers or aircraft tenders shall be naval aviators or naval aviation observers who are otherwise qualified. (44 Stat. 767, ch. 668.)

[From the joint service pay act, June 10, 1922, sec. 20]

Exclusive of the Army Air Corps, and student aviators and qualified aircraft pilots of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, the number of officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act who may be required by competent authority to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President, shall not at any one time exceed 1 per cent of the total authorized commissioned strength of such service.

Mr. Chairman, a previous law provided that one-half of 1 per cent of the total number of officers of the Navy could be detailed for duty involving flying, besides naval aviators, and receive flight pay. This law was later changed to the above; namely, providing that 1 per cent of the total number of officers in the Navy could be given flight orders.

The most recent law thus permits the Secretary of the Navy to detail to duty involving flying, with the award of flight pay, 92 officers. The Navy Department has never taken full advantage of this law nor employed this number,

but has carefully restricted the number so detailed as much as possible. There are now 57 nonaviator officers instead of the 92 allowed, who have flight orders, including 27 medical officers, 12 aerologists, 5 naval aviation observers, and 13 others. The flag officers detailed to duty involving flying at present include two—the Chief of Bureau of Aeronautics and the Commander Aircraft, Battle Fleet, both of whom are naval aviation observers. There is also a captain naval aviation observer, ordered to command the carrier *Lexington*. All of these officers' duties require them to make regular and frequent flights in aircraft, and they have flight orders and the laws so intended. The law establishing the Bureau of Aeronautics requires the chief of bureau to be a pilot or observer, and that 30 per cent of each grade below that of rear admiral be naval aviation observers or naval aviators, the evident intent of the law being that they should engage in regular and frequent flights. There are two naval aviation observers, besides the chief of bureau, in the Bureau of Aeronautics, who were so qualified in order to comply with this law, and whose duties require regular and frequent flights in aircraft. Another aviation observer is the officer in charge of the naval aircraft factory. His duties require regular and frequent flights and he has flight orders. The flight orders of these officers are considered absolutely necessary and justifiable in every sense of the word.

It is highly desirable that a certain number of medical officers and aerologists have flight orders. Their detail has resulted in increased efficiency and safer flying for all the personnel concerned.

It will be seen, however, that the detailing to duty involving flying of nonaviators is an administrative matter in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy, authorized by the above-mentioned laws, and that it was evidently the intent of the Congress in passing these laws that the Chief of Bureau of Aeronautics and at least 30 per cent of the officers of each grade detailed in the Bureau of Aeronautics, and the commanding officers of aircraft carriers, should be aircraft pilots or aircraft observers, and engage in frequent and regular flights.

The total flight pay received by the 57 nonaviator officers in the entire aeronautic organization who have flight orders is \$95,145.

There are 1,097 enlisted men (exclusive of enlisted pilots) who have flight orders, whose total flight pay amounts to \$688,851. These men are flying radiomen, gunners, and mechanics. It is absolutely necessary for the efficiency and safety of aviation that these men have flight orders. The number is restricted and kept to the lowest possible limit, as is the case with officers.

It will be seen that the authorization by law for flight orders to nonaviators was made after the most careful consideration by Congress and that the number awarded flight orders by the Navy Department has been kept to the lowest possible limit consistent with efficiency and safety. Proof of this is in the fact that only 57 officer nonaviators have flight orders, whereas a maximum of 92 is allowed by law. Likewise the appropriations for the current fiscal year carried funds for flight orders for a maximum of 1,600 enlisted men, whereas the average number of flight orders actually in effect has been 1,472, including enlisted pilots.

Mr. Chairman, as my good friend, Eddie Rickenbacker, indicates, the fact is well known that aviation duty is much more hazardous than other naval duty. The principle of giving increased pay for performing this duty has been established by the justice of law and of custom. For the Navy this increase has been 50 per cent of the base pay of all rates and ranks of enlisted men and officers. It has compensated them for the extra hazard of their duties; it has permitted them to make provision for the care of their families by life insurance, to purchase the additional uniforms required in aviation duties, and to cover the extra expenses which an aviator incurs in the execution of his duties and for which he can not always obtain recompense from the Government.

The officers assigned to aviation duty must fly. Their flying may be of different kinds, but the flying must be

done. The ensigns, lieutenants (junior grade), and the lieutenants (second and first lieutenants) and captains of the Marine Corps on sea duty or duty in the field comprise the squadrons and fleet aviation units or the watch officers of our rigid airships. Their flying is intensive, dangerous, and mandatory. They can not pick and choose the kind of flying they want to do, the types of planes to fly in, nor the days on which they will fly. Their flying is dictated by rigid schedules of operation, which include gunnery, bombing, air tactics, scouting, patrol, observation, and all those functions included in war games. It involves flying off and on carriers, being catapulted from ships, landing and taking off from the open sea. Their operations are carried on far from land and even far from surface ships. For some of the marines it involves participation in actual guerrilla warfare, with casualties resulting from enemy gunfire.

These same officers—ensigns, lieutenants (junior grade), and lieutenants—when they go to shore duty become the flight instructors at the various training centers. They train students in flying day after day the year round, or they are assigned as test pilots at the various test stations, or as test pilots to fly planes newly overhauled, erected, or repaired. Their intensive and hazardous flying continues whether the officers are ashore or afloat. An increase in these officers' pay of 50 per cent is but just and proper to induce them to become naval aviators and to enable them to cover up with life insurance and other protection to themselves and their families.

The lieutenant commanders—majors, Marine Corps—come next in rank. These are the squadron commanders and executive officers of the Navy squadrons at sea, the executive officers of our rigid airships, or the squadron commanders in the field. They have all the flying, the same kind of flying, that the more junior officers have, but added to all that is the responsibility for the safe conduct of the squadrons to their objectives, the proper performance of the mission at hand, and then the safe conduct of the squadrons back to their carriers, ships, or bases. They have administrative and executive responsibility in addition to all the hazards of daily flying on naval missions.

Ashore these officers are the chief instructors at training centers, or the heads of departments at naval air stations, where their duties require them to fly intensively to supervise the work of their subordinates. Some lieutenant commanders are assigned as inspectors of naval aircraft, others to administrative duties in the Navy Department, but they all must fly in the execution of their duties. This flying includes the hazardous checking, testing, and inspecting of new equipment in the air. During the fiscal years 1929, 1930, and 1931 the average flying time for lieutenant commanders flying in all capacities was 140 hours per year. This includes every lieutenant commander, no matter what billet he was filling. An increase of pay of 50 per cent for these lieutenant commanders is eminently justified by the flying duty to which they are assigned and assignable.

Mr. Chairman, at this time it appears proper to reiterate that flying involves military or naval missions that may be of short duration, but full of action. In dive bombing, for instance, the pilot of a fighting plane can take off, drop his bombs, and be back on the ground in 20 minutes. If he does this three times a day, his total time for the day is one hour, during which time he has exposed himself to collision with other planes, the stripping of the wings from his plane, and to fire and engine failure caused by high-diving speeds. In aerial combat, a squadron may take off from a carrier, meet the "enemy," engage in all the hazards of the ensuing mêlée, and be back on the carrier in an hour. So on throughout the various types of aerial duties. Each flight may be short or long, but each flight on naval and Marine Corps missions usually contains some danger occasioned by naval flying duty.

Above the lieutenant commanders (majors in the Marine Corps) come the commanders (lieutenant colonels)—men who have passed through the hard apprenticeship of the lower ranks and who have been properly rewarded by pro-

motion. These officers are the executive officers of air stations, of aircraft carriers, or aircraft tenders, of rigid airships, and administrative officers ashore. It has long been the desire of the Navy to have commanders (lieutenant colonels) in command of the various wings of aircraft. Up to now this has been impossible because, as naval aviation expanded, the demand for commander aviators in administrative and executive billets has exceeded the supply. As soon as enough commanders are available, it is planned to assign them as wing commanders. Their present duties are executive and administrative because the lessons learned during the days of their apprenticeship make them eminently fitted for such duty. They are employed on aviation duty because of their knowledge of aviation matters. Their flying is necessarily somewhat reduced because they are employed in positions which require their aviation knowledge, acquired in intensive flying, to administer naval aviation, but they must maintain that knowledge by flying, or their efforts suffer accordingly. New planes, new methods, new tactics, new policies, require their constant attention; and unless these officers keep familiar with the new things by flying, their value to the Navy will fall off proportionately. However, the fact that the number of flying hours is lowered, in no way influences life-insurance companies toward reducing premiums, nor reduces the financial obligations that increased rank and responsibilities have brought on, nor detracts from the justice of increased pay for hazardous duty in maintaining their ability and increased responsibility. From these officers are selected the captains and admirals for high command in later years. Their aviation experience must be capitalized, and their recompense must be such as to induce them to stay in aviation, otherwise their experience is lost, and their value for future aviation assignments is reduced. The average flying time for each commander for the fiscal years 1929, 1930, and 1931 was only somewhat less than that for each lieutenant commander.

Mr. Chairman, the captains in the Navy (colonels of the Marine Corps) are the commanding officers of aircraft carriers and tenders, of naval air stations, the chiefs of staff of the flag officers, and the commanding officers of rigid airships. Through these officers are executed the plans and operation of all naval aviation. The success or failure of these officers in their duties means the success or failure of naval aviation. In 1931 there were only nine captains in the Navy on aviation duty. The billets for these officers are filled as necessary, and each billet is of vital importance. During the past three fiscal years the captains on aviation duty flew more than the commanders did.

The three admirals on aviation duties are the high commanders. Theirs is the responsibility for all naval aviation. Their ability, their experience, and their courage control the destinies of naval aviation, and the efficiency of naval aviation may well mean the safety of the Nation. Many times 50 per cent increase in pay is too little for these men.

Their foresight and their immediate efforts may in one short decision put their value to the Nation far above evaluation in dollars and cents. Their flying to accompany their fleets of airplanes, in rigid airships, in furthering the development of the Nation's defense is hazardous. They have taken on many and unescapable obligations, and they should accordingly be able to carry these obligations in a fitting manner. Their responsibilities are too great to justify any reduction in their increased pay for hazardous duty. Their flying is hazardous, but more hazardous to health and well-being is the responsibility that they carry for the lives of their subordinates. It requires much more courage to order a hundred planes into the air on a dangerous mission than it takes to pilot one of the hundred planes. It takes high courage to order a rigid airship on a new and untried kind of flight or to order the launching of aircraft from a carrier at sea in the face of darkness, low visibility, and other hazardous conditions. This courage takes its toll in health and happiness and it should be adequately rewarded.

The morale and efficiency of naval aviation are vitally dependent upon the services of the senior officers, com-

manders, captains, and admirals, many of whom have been with the naval aviation since its inception and who have brought it to its present high state of efficiency. In recognition of this fact, the Morrow Board went so far as to recommend "the giving of temporary rank as captain, commander, or lieutenant commander to any officer of a junior grade when he is detailed to duty requiring specialization in aviation and for which the higher rank is proper." The senior officers should be given an inducement, aside from a natural love of this branch of the service, to remain with naval aviation. They should and do fly as much as their administrative and command functions permit. It is manifestly unfair to expect them to continue in a duty which they know is dangerous for a decreased sum of money which would hardly cover the excessive life-insurance premiums they would have to pay. For example, a flat rate which would induce a junior officer to fly is not a large enough percentage increase of pay of the senior officer to cause him to overlook his responsibilities to himself and his family by risking his life at a time when he should be anticipating security for himself and his growing sons and daughters.

Mr. Chairman, a study has been made showing the savings that could be effected if certain flat rates of flight pay were substituted above certain ranks for the present 50 per cent increase. This study shows that if the average captain's flight pay (\$3,000) were the maximum paid, the saving would be exactly \$1,000 per year; if the average commander's flight pay (\$2,450) were the maximum paid, the saving would be \$19,600 per year, or 1.11 per cent of the total flight pay of all Navy and Marine Corps officers; if the average lieutenant commander's (major's) flight pay (\$1,958) were the maximum, the saving would be \$29,248 per year; and if one went down the list as far as lieutenants and made the average lieutenant's flight pay (\$1,422) the maximum paid, the total saving would be only slightly over \$100,000 per year, or the cost of two flying boats.

It is understood that economy is the sole reason for the suggestion that flight pay be reduced. The above study of changes in the system of flight pay shows that inconsiderable savings will result. Certainly the saving would be insufficient to compensate for the blow to the morale and efficiency of the officers concerned. The principle of increased pay for extrahazardous duty has been well recognized. It should be pointed out that if the pay of the Navy is cut in the interests of economy, such cut will automatically carry with it a cut in the extra pay for flying, because the increase now is 50 per cent of the person's base pay. Thus a cut in flight pay now plus a future cut in the pay of the Navy would cause a double cut in the pay of naval aviators.

Mr. Chairman, it has long been recognized that extra reward should be given for extrahazardous duty or work. This is true in all walks of life and is by no means confined to the armed services. In the business world it is impossible to get workers in munition factories for the same wage as those who work in cotton factories, or sappers and miners at the pay of ditch diggers.

Flight pay, or the extra compensation paid to those engaged in the extrahazardous duty of flying, has been recognized by the Congress as being just and equitable practically since the inception of military and naval aviation. It is recognized and paid to flying personnel in the service of all countries in so far as known. In 1914 and again in 1922 the Navy Department declared itself to be in favor of flight pay. The Congress recognized the value and merits of flight pay and provided for its payment by the necessary legislation. In 1925 the Morrow Board carefully considered this question and recommended:

Considering the extrahazardous nature of flying, we believe that the principle of extra pay for flying should be recognized as permanent in time of peace.

The report of the Interdepartmental Pay Board of July 19, 1929, contains the following:

The foregoing principles are not intended to affect the right of officers regardless of rank to receive special compensation while performing duty involving extra hazard as determined by the Congress.

Thus we see that the principle of flight pay has for a long time had the approval and backing of the Navy Department, the Congress, and of special investigators.

It has been pointed out that the principal of extra compensation for extrahazardous duty is so well recognized as to be almost axiomatic, and that flight pay has been so recognized by both law and custom as to be its natural corollary. Statistics covering the five calendar years 1926-1930 show the average annual death rate of naval aviators killed in aviation accidents to be 21.34 per thousand. The average annual death rate of all officers, excluding aviators, from accidental causes, for the same period, was 0.71 per thousand. This means that the accidental death rate of the aviator engaged in the normal pursuit of his duties was thirty times that of his brother officer during the above 5-year period.

In addition to the much greater probability of early death, the aviator is faced with the danger of injury to a far greater extent than is his brother officer on other duties. The line existing between fatal accidents and injury accidents is so fine that it is difficult to define. Luck, skill, split-second decisions, and lightning-fast executions frequently change a potentially fatal accident to a minor one with no injury to personnel. To cite only one example of many which frequently occur: Two planes in company were caught in a fog. One pilot, attempting to turn back to the clear, hooked a wing on the ground and both pilot and passenger were killed. The other landed blind, and, fortunately, striking no major obstructions, both pilot and passenger were uninjured. Personnel and material factors, and other causes too numerous to enumerate, frequently cause loss of life in a comparatively minor accident. In many instances, people otherwise uninjured are drowned when unable to extricate themselves from a plane which has crashed in the water. These very apparent hazards are not considered in the above comparison of death rates, and yet they are ever present.

Safety in operations has steadily increased and is constantly pointed to with pride. Let us consider this. In 1926 there were flown 4,380 hours per fatality, and in 1930, 14,710 hours, an increase in safety of operations of 236 per cent. The death rate for 1926 was 21.70 per thousand, and for 1930 it was 18.45 per thousand. Although safety of operations increased 236 per cent, safety of personnel, with which we are vitally concerned, increased only 15 per cent. Also for the year 1930, when the great record of 14,710 hours per fatality was made, the ratio of the death rate of aviators to nonaviators was 102.5 to 1, an abnormally high figure, showing that the extra hazard was present to a greater degree than ever before, even in our "safest" year.

One of the reasons for the above paradox lies in the ever-increasing use of aviation, especially in the fleet at sea. Naval aviation, being an integral part of our combatant forces, participates in practically all fleet maneuvers, and maneuvers at sea with aircraft are steadily increasing. Only the advent of more reliable power plants, radios, and direction finders, flotation gear and rubber boats, and other developments and improvements in recent years and the increased skill and greater experience of our aviators have prevented the death rate from being higher than it actually is. That the aviation hazard is considered real by senior naval officers in the fleet is shown by the following quotation from the report of the commander in chief of the United States Fleet in the 1931 maneuvers:

I wish to call your attention to the fact that personnel of the air force in the air come nearer to operating under war conditions, so far as the hazard of their profession is concerned, than any other naval personnel.

Mr. Chairman, aside from death or injury in accidents, the aviator is constantly suffering deleterious effects caused by actual operations. The injurious effects are many, there being particular strain on the eyes, ears, and heart. The eye-muscle balance is subject to derangement because of the rapid change of focus required in constant shift from instrument board to far horizons. Exophoria and other eye

troubles develop as a result of the goggles and the wind-blast.

Rapid changes of pressure and of temperature encountered in a dive of 10,000 feet or more aggravate infections of the sinus passages, the nose, and the throat, and at the same time are particularly injurious to the ears. There is almost invariably loss of acuity in hearing as a result of these factors, coupled with the constant noise of the engine. The pull-outs from dives and the rapid changes of direction and velocity in aerial combat produce a tremendous strain on the contents of the chest and abdomen, and may cause injury of such nature as to result in complete disability.

Since the human body is not adjusted to withstand the demands placed upon it by high altitude, there is, naturally, an unusual strain upon the heart and whole circulatory system when the pilot reaches excessive heights. The air is a new element for man; his body suffers in an attempt to conquer it. Until such time as evolution can so change his body to meet the new requirements, deleterious effects must continue to exist.

Mr. Chairman, all life-insurance companies consider that flying is an extrahazardous occupation. Some companies will insure aviators in the Army and Navy, but they require extra premiums of from \$12 to \$50 per year per thousand. Even the Army and Navy mutual aid associations exact extra rates. Some of the large companies, for example, Penn Mutual, Aetna, Union Central, and others, refuse to insure aviators.

The following table gives an example of the increased cost of insurance for aviators. The figures on costs shown in the first column were obtained from a well-known commercial company:

Insurance costs per year for \$10,000 policy for man aged 25 years

	Non-flyer	Naval aviator					
		\$12 load- ing	Per cent increase	\$25 load- ing	Per cent increase	\$50 load- ing ¹	Per cent increase
Straight life.....	\$147.20	\$267.20	81	\$397.20	177	\$647.20	439
20-pay life.....	221.90	341.90	54	471.90	113	721.90	225
20-year endow- ment.....	403.10	523.10	29	653.10	62	903.10	124

¹ Loadings are the extra premiums required of aviators by all companies that will insure aviators. They range from \$12 to \$50 per year per thousand. The amount of insurance obtainable from one company is generally limited for officers required by orders to make frequent flights.

Mr. Chairman, it has been shown that extra compensation for hazardous duty is sound, that flight pay has always been considered reasonable and just, and that extra hazard does exist in connection with flying. Several methods for giving just, extra compensation have been proposed, the most prominent being:

- (a) Percentage of normal pay (present method).
- (b) Flat rate.
- (c) Free insurance to those engaged in flying duty.

This is the present method and was adopted by Congress after due consideration. It is believed to be the best one for the following reasons:

- (1) It has the approval and backing of the personnel involved and actually incurring the extra hazard.
- (2) It is the most fair and just to the individual involved.
- (3) It has the approval and backing of custom and Congress.
- (4) It is not unduly expensive, as compared with other proposed methods.

In this connection attention is invited to the fact that as originally planned flight pay consisted of 50 per cent of pay and allowances. This has been reduced to 50 per cent of the base pay.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the flat rate, the contention is made that the risk for all flyers being equal the compensation should be equal. To this I can not subscribe. The senior officer is considered to be more valuable than his junior brother, as recognized by the fact that he has more experience, occupies more responsible positions, and

is given a larger salary. Also he has greater responsibilities, especially as regards dependents, and the risk he runs as to his health is greater with age.

One fact that should be remembered is that officers rotate in their duties. A man occupying an administrative position on one tour of duty is, on his next tour, almost invariably ordered to duty in the fleet, where the hazards are multiplied. Even while on his administrative status he is often called upon to perform flights of extremely hazardous nature, so that it may be safely said that all naval aviators are, in the long run, subjected to approximately the same hazards.

A sum of X dollars may be sufficient to induce a young officer to risk his life in flying, because such sum is fairly large in proportion to the normal salary of an officer of his grade. With a senior officer this does not hold. His normal salary is increased over that of his junior by reason of his increased worth to the Government, his responsibilities, the demands made upon him by his increased rank as a representative of the Government, his dependents, increased insurance, and so forth. For these reasons his flight pay should be correspondingly increased. The officer of increased rank, such as the commander of a squadron, vessel, or air station, is responsible not only for his own life in the air but he must also assume the responsibility for the lives of his subordinates. It is as logical to contend that the six months' gratuity pay given to an officer's dependents in the case of his death should be the same for an ensign as for a rear admiral as to contend that all ranks should receive the same flight pay.

It has been proposed to substitute a flat rate of a certain amount for all persons engaged in duty involving flying, regardless of rank; in other words, to substitute a flat rate for the present system. Aviation had no representative on the Interdepartmental Pay Board, but in hearings before the board aviation personnel opposed any change in the present system of flight pay. The Interdepartmental Pay Board did recommend, however, a flat rate of \$125 a month for all officers engaged in flying as a substitute for the present system of flight pay. The board made this recommendation on the assumption that its proposed increase of base pay and allowances would be adopted, and the change to a flat rate of \$125 a month was coupled with this proposal.

At this point I desire to point out that the pay for aviators is in almost every case less than the pay recommended by the Interdepartmental Pay Board for nonflying officers in corresponding ranks.

I further desire to point out that if the flat rate of \$125 a month were substituted for the present system of flight pay for officers alone it would cause an increase in the total appropriation for flight pay of \$193,198. For officers and enlisted men there would be caused an increase in total appropriations of \$1,660,519.

If the flat rate for officers only were reduced to \$100 per month—\$1,200 per year—the reduction or saving to the Government would be only \$114,302. If it were further reduced—for officers only—to \$83.33 per month—\$1,000 a year—the reduction or saving would be only \$319,302. If the flat rates were also applied to enlisted men, there would be a total increase—at the rate of \$100 per month—of \$857,119. Under the rate of \$83.33 per month the total increase would be \$321,519.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents of the flat-rate system argue, however, that the risk is equal and the pay should therefore be equal. If such a principle is accepted, the flight pay of an enlisted man under flight orders should be the same as for an officer engaged in duty involving flying. Consistency demands this.

I believe that a wrong impression exists as to distribution of flight pay in the various grades. An analysis of flight pay for the fiscal year 1931 shows that less than 1 per cent of flight pay is received by flag officers; 2.42 per cent by captains; 5.71 per cent by commanders; 16.43 per cent by lieutenant commanders; 36.41 per cent by lieutenants; 35.55 per cent by lieutenants, junior grade, and ensigns; and 2.59

per cent by warrant officers; 72 per cent of total flight pay goes to lieutenants, junior grade, ensigns, and lieutenants. Only 5.3 per cent—\$66,400—of the total amount of flight pay went to officers on flight duty who are over 45 years of age. During the current fiscal year there are only two rear admirals on flying duty, so that their total pay is 0.6 per cent of the total officers' flight pay. Seven rear admirals who were formerly in aviation and received flight pay have returned to regular Navy duties.

Mr. Chairman, there is a general impression or belief that there will be a steady and great increase in aviators in the upper grades, resulting in a great increase of flight pay. Such is not the case, as will be seen from the following table:

Naval aviators and observers (U. S. Navy) by ranks, for fiscal years 1931, 1932, and 1933; estimated number that will be assigned on September 30 of each fiscal year

Rank	1931	Per cent of total	1932	Per cent of total	1933 (estimated)	Per cent of total
Rear admiral.....	3	0.45	2	0.26	3	0.36
Captain.....	9	1.36	10	1.30	13	1.51
Commander.....	21	3.17	29	3.77	29	3.44
Lieutenant commander.....	77	11.61	77	10.01	79	9.36
Lieutenant.....	258	38.91	266	34.58	268	31.75
Lieutenant (junior grade).....	250	37.71	306	39.79	340	40.28
Ensign.....	22	3.32	57	7.40	65	11.26
Warrant officer.....	21	3.17	22	2.86	17	2.01
Total.....	663		769		844	

It will be noted from the above table that the number of naval aviators in the senior grades (rear admiral, captain, commander) will increase slightly during the next few years to meet the actual needs of the service; a total of only 14 in the upper grades in 1933-34 as compared with 1931, whereas there is an increase of 173 in lieutenants, lieutenants (junior grade), and ensigns.

Owing to the newness of aviation there has always been a shortage of senior officer aviators, so that officers of junior rank have necessarily been assigned to positions commensurate with senior rank. However, the number in the three senior grades will stabilize in the near future, and the number in the senior grades will remain the same. Officers in these three grades will then be returned to regular line duties. Seven rear admirals who have served in aviation have been so returned already.

The increase in flight pay required for increases in the senior grades in the fiscal years 1931-1933 will amount altogether to \$34,600. It will be noted from the above tables that the percentage of increases in the upper grades is practically the same, being increased in some cases and decreased in others.

Mr. Chairman, I can not too forcibly express my conviction that the substitution of insurance for flight pay would be ruinous to naval aviation. In the first place, insurance is the personal and private concern of the individual. The amount of life insurance that an individual should properly carry depends upon the number of actual dependents that he may have and the financial resources of himself and his dependents, and his financial needs. Therefore, it would not be justifiable to give to all aviators insurance for a fixed amount irrespective of the status of the individual as regards dependents, his personal resources, and obligations.

The principle of extra compensation for extrahazardous duty has been accepted as sound. In the case of individuals with no dependents, wherein would be the compensation received by insurance which they neither want nor need?

One important feature of this phase of the subject is the direct financial loss that would result from this substitution in the case of many officers. The majority of officers having dependents have used their flight pay to carry expensive insurance policies which they could not have afforded on normal salary, and they increase their insurance with increase in dependents. Since some of these policies now in effect are endowment policies, partly paid up, the revocation of flight pay would necessarily require the forfeiture of the

policy, with a direct, unfair monetary loss to the officers concerned.

I have no hesitancy in saying that the extra compensation for the hazards of flying has been well deserved and has had much to do with the success we have gained in naval aviation. The equalization of material naval strength by treaty agreements means that superiority must be sought in personnel. I believe that we now possess that superiority and that it would be grossly unwise to sacrifice or to do anything to lessen the high morale, and with it the efficiency of naval aviators, in an attempt to effect a comparatively small monetary saving.

By hard fighting and constant loyal effort, especially on the part of naval aviators, naval aviation has been kept as an integral part of the Navy. United States naval aviation undoubtedly leads in the navies of the world to-day. In this connection I invite attention to excerpts from two articles which show the regard in which others hold us. First, Admiral Lord Beatty in a letter to the London Times under date of April 30, 1930:

Sir: * * * The navy to-day is the most up to date and efficient navy in the world, except in one respect, and that is the air equipment. The air wing of the United States Navy, owing to the single control exercised over the United States Navy, is far ahead of our fleet air arm. They carry out exercises on a scale quite impossible in our fleet. Cooperation between their ship-borne and shore-based aircraft has reached a high state of efficiency; with us it is nonexistent.

And second, an article appearing in *La Revue Maritime*, of November, 1930, which won the first prize in the *Académie de Marine*, France:

* * * The result of this organization is that naval aviation in the United States is much ahead of all others in the world; their Navy is distinguished by the prodigious development of its aviation, and particularly of its employment. It was the first to employ catapults, and it holds enviable rank among world's records.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years since the advent of flying we have built up in the Navy a great organization based on sound principles. The most important part of this organization is not the material but the personnel—naval aviation personnel.

United States naval aviation is on a sound foundation. Why do anything, especially anything of a doubtful nature, to shake this foundation, to upset and undo all we have so carefully and laboriously built up? Remove flight pay or drastically change it and you will ruin United States naval aviation morale as it exists to-day, and also Army aviation. I say this advisedly and from an intimate knowledge not only of naval aviation but also of the Navy as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: Page 25, line 16, beginning with the word "that," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute amendment, instead of striking out the language just referred to by the gentleman from New York, beginning on line 19, page 25, strike out the balance of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRITTEN: Page 25, line 19, after the colon, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, that will have the effect of preserving music for the Navy. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York covers two provisos in the bill, and I am sure the Members of the House would much prefer to vote upon them separately. Particularly do I feel that Members of the House are interested in retaining music for the Navy. There is little enough in the Navy for the officers and men without taking from them this occasional music. [Applause.]

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSS. In view of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to inquire if I will have an opportunity, after this vote is taken, to offer an amendment to strike out the proviso from line 15 to line 19?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia].

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on my amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not the object sought by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten] be attained by asking for a division of the subject matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of that opinion, but the gentleman has offered it as a substitute amendment.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered. That will leave the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois before the House. After that is disposed of, the gentleman from Connecticut may offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. Britten.

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

I hope the chairman of the committee will state to the House that, as far as economy for the next fiscal year is concerned, there will be none effected, because any musician now in the service may reenlist. Surely all of the enlistments are not expiring this year. What will be the result? The result will be that as a musician's enlistment expires and he does not wish to reenlist, or he dies, his place may not be filled, so that it is quite possible a battleship may have a band that is absolutely helpless and unable to perform. If the musicians who play solo parts should die or be transferred, a band may be left entirely dismembered.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that music in the Navy is not a luxury. It is a necessity. If 1,200 men are placed on a battleship or a group of Americans are stationed in any of the distant posts and they are left there day after day without some music to break the monotony, the discipline and morale will go to pieces. Why is it that every division, every brigade, and every regiment demands a band in times of hostility?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The only amusement that the men on the battleship have is the moving pictures and the band, is it not?

Mr. LaGuardia. I am not talking about the amusement side of it. I insist that music, a band, is essential in any military or naval organization. It is almost impossible to go through the setting-up exercises unless there is music for the rhythm. The same is true as to drills. It is absolutely a part of the daily routine work. I say, Mr. Chairman, this subject can not be indifferently brushed aside. It is a most serious matter.

To take 355, or whatever number you want to reduce them, and drop them at once might support a plea of economy, but you can not make that plea when you have to wait until they die.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman be good enough to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not it is intended to take the bandmen off of battleships? I might say that these 355 men referred to were to be bandmen in navy yards, and would include the destruction of the Navy Band, but would not apply to bands on battleships.

Mr. AYRES. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It means that if the enlistment of a bandmaster expires he is out of the service; he can not reenlist.

Mr. LaGuardia. No, no; it does not apply to reenlistments. That is why this amendment is worth nothing. A musician in the service may reenlist. The provision of the bill is:

The total number of enlisted men of the rating of musicians, first class, and musicians, second class, shall be reduced by 355 by discontinuing new enlistments and reenlistments not continuous.

That means, of course, that every man now in the service can and will reenlist.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I should like to say that this matter did not originate with the committee. The Secretary of the Navy in a letter dated March 19, 1932, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Economy, at that time the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. BYRNS, indicated that the Marine Band would serve all needs of the Navy in Washington and that "military features" would not be affected if bands at navy yards, except Cavite, P. I., were discontinued. The Secretary specifically excepted bands at training stations and at the Naval Academy. The adoption of this course ultimately would dispense with about 355 bandmen.

Mr. LaGuardia. The Secretary of the Navy is the last man in the United States who should take such a stand. Last fall when I objected to the Navy Band playing an admission concert in New York the answer was that the Secretary of the Navy put on his yachting cap and went to see a lawn-tennis game in New York and insisted on having the band with him. If the Secretary of the Navy recommends abolishing music in the Navy, he does not know what he is talking about.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGuardia. I believe that music in the Navy is absolutely necessary, not as a luxury, not as an amusement, but for the proper morale and discipline of the personnel.

Let me repeat for the third or fourth time that there is no economy effected by this provision. You can not prevent a reenlistment of continuous service, but you have to wait for these men to die.

So, let us not cripple the music of the Navy. I appeal to my colleagues to vote down this provision of the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGuardia. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. This same Secretary of the Navy took the position in the name of economy that the Navy Band could not play at the United States Spanish War Veterans' reunion in Milwaukee, but at the same time they are making arrangements to have the United States Marine Band go to Canada and play God Save the King.

Mr. LaGuardia. If anyone is to blame for the band not going to Milwaukee, it would be the Secretary of the Navy. I am not to blame for that. I am for the Navy Band playing for the Navy and not competing with unemployed musicians. I have a right to defend the Navy Band. I believe in the band for strictly naval purposes and am against this band going on a concert tour booked by a cheap private booking agent making money out of it. That is why I am sure the House will listen to my appeal to continue music in the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

I wish to take but a few minutes of the time of the committee to show the peculiar position into which these bands will ultimately be placed if the proviso in the bill is adopted. It provides that the bandmen go out of service as they retire, not necessarily at the end of their 4-year enlistment, but as they retire, and their places shall not be filled.

It happens that this year one of our best players in the Navy Band will retire. He is an outstanding solo player. That place can not be filled and the loss of that instrument may destroy the value of the band.

If we are going to have music, if we are going to have a Navy Band, let us have a Navy Band that is second to none; let us have a real band. If we are going to lose the first cornetist and perhaps the slide trombonist and maybe a click-clack drummer and be unable to put others in their places, the result will be that we will have no band worth while and we might just as well discontinue it and refuse to appropriate for it completely. But in the name of Heaven, if this wonderful aggregation of players that we call the Navy Band is worth while, let us not destroy it by indirection. That is what this legislation contemplates.

Let the Navy have music. Let the people in Washington have music. Let the people all over the United States hear the Navy Band, as they do once or twice a week over the radio. No charge is made for that music. It is worth millions to the psychology of the people of the country. Who could fail to be happy when he hears some of Benter's fine music over the radio? I think it is better music than that of the Marine Band; it is more mirthful. If we are going to discontinue one of these bands, let us do away with the Marine Band. Let us put one of these bands out of business completely, but do not let either of them continue to be deprived of three or four important instruments. That is what the proviso does. I hope you gentlemen will vote with us to retain the Navy bands and retain music in the Navy. The gradual saving to be made is too costly. It is false economy.

Mr. Chairman, economy in Federal expenditure, as everyone knows, is to-day not a theory but a condition demanded at almost any sacrifice. There is one point at which the country has a right to expect the sacrifice will not be made. That is the point at which the interests of national defense can be imperiled.

Yesterday the House Appropriations Committee, continuing its sharp reductions of the President's Budget estimates, cut the amount recommended for naval requirements \$31,921,657 below appropriations for the current year and \$15,336,984 under President Hoover's Budget proposal. As left by the committee, the Navy for "direct" needs is assigned \$326,340,466 for the fiscal year 1933.

The ordinary citizen—and as far as that is concerned, the average Member of Congress—has only limited knowledge of the actual necessities of the fleet. The country at large has confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of the men in charge of the Navy. It will be preponderantly inclined to believe that the House Appropriations Committee was ill-advised when it ignored the following message from Admiral Pratt, Chief of Naval Operations, which was submitted when Congress began consideration of the annual Navy budget:

The Navy Department is constantly seeking means to reduce expenditures. One of the most obvious methods is to decommission ships. A careful survey is made annually and only such ships are kept in commission as are considered to be absolutely essential to provide security for the Nation and to perform the functions assigned to the naval service.

Under stress of existing conditions we have cut our operating forces to the danger zone. We can not go any further without jeopardizing our national security.

International conditions are such to-day as to render it unwise, in my opinion, to make further cuts in the operating forces of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, little needs to be added to that sailorlike and statesmanlike declaration. Surely in a Budget aggregating four and a half billion dollars and in a proposed "omnibus" slash of five hundred million and odd it should not be beyond the wit of Congress to cheesepare in directions which will leave the Nation's first concern, its security, unquestionably unimpaired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 67, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I move to strike out the proviso beginning in line 15, down to and including the colon in line 19, on page 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 25, line 15, strike out the proviso beginning in line 15, down to and including the colon on line 19.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have searched the hearings in connection with this particular proviso and can not find where any information is contained therein. I asked the chairman of the subcommittee how much would be saved through the adoption of this proviso and he told me \$30,000.

I want to read from page 18 of the report.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It will save about \$275,000.

Mr. GOSS. I wish to have the record correct. How will it save that?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Because this repeals a continuing law. It will save about \$30,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. GOSS. I read the following from page 18 of the report:

Besides the other limitations and provisions of a legislative character previously referred to herein, there has been included on page 25 of the bill a prohibition against assigning additional men to the Fleet Naval Reserve. A similar provision has been included under the Marine Corps section of the bill applicable to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve. Assigned men are former enlisted men who, for a consideration of \$25 per annum, obligate themselves to serve in the Navy or Marine Corps in the event of war occurring within four years from the date of expiration of their enlistments. In the committee's judgment, this is a needless expense.

I call upon the members of the committee who are interested in national defense as referred to by the Navy and the Marine Corps to vote to strike out this proviso.

I want to say we have an Officers' Reserve upon whom we can call in time of war, but that will not be true as far as enlisted men are concerned if this proviso should remain in the bill. These men agree, upon being paid \$25 a year, to go to war upon call, and they are men who have been thoroughly trained in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

It seems to me this is silly economy and economy that is aimed at national defense.

I hope the committee in its wisdom will vote to strike out this part of the paragraph. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Goss) there were—ayes 49, noes 52.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel, \$149,045,405, of which sum \$1,000,000 shall be immediately available, and the money herein specifically appropriated or transferred from the clothing and small stores' fund to this appropriation as herein authorized for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers not specifically appropriated for in this act: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipmen whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1932, would result in exceeding at any time an allowance of three midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress; of one midshipman for Porto Rico, a native of the island, appointed on nomination of the governor, and of three midshipmen from Porto Rico appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner; and of two midshipmen for the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify in any way existing laws relative to the appointment of midshipmen at large from the enlisted personnel of the naval service or from the Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calen-

dar year 1933 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission for at least nine months prior to such admission: *Provided further*, That hereafter no person holding a civil office or position, appointive or elective, under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia or under any corporation a majority of the capital stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States shall be entitled, during the period of such incumbency, to retired pay from the United States for or on account of services as a commissioned officer in the Navy or Marine Corps at a rate in excess of an amount which, when combined with the annual rate of compensation from any such civil office or position, makes the total rate from both sources more than \$3,000; and when the retired pay amounts to or exceeds the rate of \$3,000 per annum such person shall be entitled to the pay of the civil office or position or the retired pay, whichever he may elect: *Provided*, That the term "retired pay" shall be construed to include credits for all military or naval service as lawfully may enter into the computation thereof.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOYLAN: Page 29, line 16, after the word "holding," strike out "a" and insert the words "an appointive."

In line 17, after the word "position," strike out the words "appointive or elective."

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to this amendment. Under the language of the provision a distinguished Member of this House, the Delegate from Hawaii, would be precluded from receiving his retirement pay. There should be no objection to this provision applying to an appointive office, because in that case a man is appointed by some authority, but it should not apply to an elective office, because in the case of an elective office a man receives his mandate from the people. If we were to adopt this provision in the bill, we would prevent the Delegate from Hawaii from receiving his retired pay.

The pay he receives as a retired officer of the Navy is the pay due him for past services and for faithful service rendered to this Government as an official in the Navy. I can not understand why a provision of this kind should be inserted in this appropriation bill. There should be no objection, as I have stated, to an appointive officer but not to an elective officer, because an elective officer is a man who has been elected by the people, with full knowledge of his record, of his career, and the service he has rendered, and for which the retired pay is a just, fair, and equitable compensation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not likely to be the fact that a man may be elected to office because of the service he has rendered to his country?

Mr. BOYLAN. Absolutely.

Mr. BRITTEN. And in the course of time such a man may be entitled to retired pay. Surely no one in this House would desire to take that away from him simply because he has been elected to office or because he has had additional glory forced upon him by his constituents. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BOYLAN. I think not, because they are just rewards for faithful service rendered to the Republic. Retired pay is not something discretionary or optional. It is something that is conferred upon a man because of service fairly and faithfully rendered. The mere fact that he is elected by the people should not militate against his standing as a retired officer.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. SWING. I do not altogether agree with the gentleman in his use of the word "reward." I like the idea that a man has earned it. It is like a man who has paid premiums to an insurance company over a period of time and finally becomes entitled to be paid a certain amount because of the premiums he has paid. His constituency knows he receives retired pay; and if because of their respect for him they desire in addition to give him an elective office, that ought to be their privilege.

Mr. BOYLAN. I think the gentleman's point is well taken, and I agree with him.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I do not get the distinction between the two. Is the gentleman in favor of the provision limiting the pay to appointive or civil-service personnel?

Mr. BOYLAN. No; I am striking out "elective" and leaving the word "appointive" in the bill. I say it should not apply to an elective office.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It seems to me if it applies to one it should apply to the other.

Mr. BOYLAN. The question has been raised as to a point of order, and it was stated that it would not apply.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman see any more justice in submitting an appointive officer to this limitation that he speaks of than an elective office?

Mr. BOYLAN. Certainly. There is all the difference in the world. Anybody can appoint a man, but everybody can not be elected by the people as their representative.

Mr. AYRES. I will put the question in another way. Does the gentleman know any more reason why a man holding an elective office should draw two salaries than a man holding an appointive office?

Mr. BOYLAN. It is not a question of salary. As the gentleman from California has stated, it is a question of something he has earned. It is not making a present or gift to him; it is something he has earned by reason of his service.

Mr. AYRES. Does not that apply also to one who is holding an appointive office?

Mr. BOYLAN. That is not in the same category. The gentleman well knows that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is not the fundamental difference just this? When you say to a person who is running for an elective office, "You are not eligible for that office," or "If you get the office you must surrender something," in effect that violates our theory of government. Very often a person who holds an appointive office has sought the position and he may be going into the same department. There is great danger in the Government appointing retired officers to positions in the same department, but when a person goes before the people and is elected to a certain position, to put a string on him and say that he must surrender something that he already has violates the real principles of our form of government; and as the gentleman well knows, if this provision goes through, a similar provision will be put on the Army bill and will take away the well-earned rewards of some of the most honorable and distinguished Members of this House.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman has well stated the matter.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. If the provision goes in the Navy bill, why should it not go in the Army bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It should.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. FISH. I would also like to ask the gentleman why the amount is placed at \$3,000. Is not that rather high?

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not know. I am not in favor of this at all. I am trying to change it. I did not put the language in here, and I want it changed to strike out "elective" and have it apply only to appointive positions.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOYLAN. But not on this particular subcommittee. The gentleman has asked a question that perhaps could be

answered by the chairman of the subcommittee. I can not answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FISH. I will ask the chairman later on.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. With reference to an elective office, I doubt whether the electors ever take into consideration the amount of pay when favoring one for an elective office. Why should one elected to an office not be put in the same position with respect to an act passed by Congress as one holding an appointive office in so far as drawing compensation from the Government on two separate pay rolls?

Mr. BOYLAN. The distinguished gentleman knows that the people, in considering the qualifications of a candidate in an election, know all about his past performances, his record is before them, and if they did not desire to elect him, knowing him to be a retired naval or military officer, they would not elect him. The people pass on that, and surely the gentleman, believing as he does in our theory of government, is willing to abide by the result of an election, which we all must do.

I do not think it is fair to militate in this way against a Member of this body if he has been elected to represent his people. If they know he is a retired officer of the Navy, why should we put a limitation upon the amount of salary he should receive, inasmuch as the retired pay, as has been brought out by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] is not a reward, but something that he has earned on account of the service he has rendered the Government.

I do not think it lies within the province of the Congress to attempt to put a limitation of this kind in an appropriation bill. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, we have in the Government service some Army officers and naval officers who are performing services that involve expenditures of millions of dollars and who are in charge of the management of plants and activities involving many more millions of dollars. These officers receive the regular salary stipulated for the grade or rank of the officer holding the position, and they receive only their salaries, without any additional pay from any other source.

Other officers hold positions civilian in their nature, like the Governor of the Panama Canal, whose salary, I believe, is \$10,000 a year. The Panama Canal pays that part of his \$10,000 salary over and above the officer's regular salary. Another is the engineer commissioner for the District of Columbia, who is paid his salary plus the amount required to make his salary the same as that of the other two commissioners. There are other Army and Navy officers holding civilian positions in the Government whose salaries are regulated in the same way.

Mr. BOYLAN. But they are not elective officers.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not yield to the gentleman from New York. The rule of fairness does not vary, whether the position held is an elective or appointive one. The grade of the work done or the responsibility of the position should regulate the amount of the salary an officer should receive. That is the rule prevailing in civil as well as official life. Congress should not try to protect some one merely because he may happen to belong to this body.

A man is retired usually because of his age or because of physical and mental disabilities. This is true in the Army or the Navy. It is believed that when a man reaches a certain age his efficiency is impaired or that he has reached an age beyond which he can not render effective service, therefore he is retired. If an individual who has been retired goes into an office, either appointive or elective, he ought to receive the salary which the office pays and no more. I doubt seriously, with unemployment rampant, as it is, if men in a retired status, drawing large retirement pay, should be appointed to positions that others can perform equally well or perhaps better.

Something has been said about certain individuals in this House who have a retired status in the Army or Navy; that this provision of the bill will take from them the amount they receive over and above the salary of \$10,000 paid to

Members of Congress. That argument weighs lightly with me. I believe every man in this House ought to receive identically the same salary. I do not believe that certain ones ought to be selected and paid a sum larger than the rest of us merely because they held another Government job before they came here.

I believe when a man runs for public office or is appointed to public office he ought to take the salary that the office pays and no more. If he is elected, his responsibilities are not necessarily greater than another who was appointed to an office. A great many people believe in appointing officers rather than in electing them. The duties and responsibilities of the position is all that should be considered in fixing the size of the wage.

The public does not know whether an individual receives retirement pay from the Government when he is elected. They are not presumed to know it. He is elected because he is nominated by a political party usually. When he comes to the floor of this House or the floor of the Senate or elsewhere, he should be on an equality with every other person holding a similar position and all should receive the same salary, and no one should be placed in a preferred pay status and be permitted to draw a larger salary than the others. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, every dollar of retired pay is presumed to be compensation to a man for some kind of disability. He is presumed to be either disabled or to have reached the end of his full usefulness. He is presumed not to be able to render a full amount of service, and he is paid for it.

Why, we all know of the past years when our friend Admiral Benson drew an admiral's retired pay, and at the same time drew a tremendous salary besides from a corporation. We objected to it then but found we could not stop it. We all know that Gen. James G. Harbord draws the retired pay of a general, and at the same time for years he has drawn a tremendous salary, which they say is \$50,000, from the Radio Corporation of America, and has for years. If he can render \$50,000 worth of services to a corporation, why could not he have continued in the regular service of the United States Army?

Gen. Charles McK. Saltzman, chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, as a retired general, is drawing \$6,000 retired pay and also a \$10,000 salary additional as chairman of the Radio Commission. Gen. Pelham D. Glassford draws \$4,312.44 retirement pay and also an \$8,000 salary additional as superintendent of police of Washington, and he is able to drive his own motorcycle all over Washington, and is fit both physically and mentally. Why should he be doing it? And I want you to remember that each one of these retired Army and Navy officers, in addition to their retired pay, and their additional salaries, have furnished to them free an automobile and a chauffeur to drive it, and they get free from the Government for themselves and their families doctors, dentists, surgeons, nurses, hospitals, medicines, and every attention when they are sick. And also remember that they have the privilege as long as they live of buying all of their family and household supplies, including coal, from the Government stores at actual Government cost, and they use Government trucks to do their hauling.

Here is Gen. Mason M. Patrick drawing a general's retired pay of \$6,000, and also \$7,500 salary additional as head of the Utilities Commission in the city of Washington. Then, there is Gen. Herbert B. Crosby drawing \$6,000 retired pay and at the same time drawing a \$9,000 salary additional as Commissioner of the District of Columbia. Here is Gen. John C. Gotwals drawing a \$9,000 salary as Engineer Commissioner, and has not rendered any service whatever therefor in months.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think the gentleman is slightly in error as to the retired pay of the Army and Navy. That is not exactly based on disability. It is based on length of service.

Mr. BLANTON. My friend is in error. I am not mistaken. I know what I am talking about. All of the facts and figures I have mentioned are true and correct. I am in favor of not retiring a single officer until he reaches a certain age, say 64, or else is retired for disability, because it costs \$13,000 first to educate them at West Point or Annapolis and then it costs about \$25,000 more to specialize their education for the next 25 years.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not at this moment. One of our friends and colleagues here in the House, who draws retired pay, authorizes me to state for him that he is not in favor of officials drawing double and that he is perfectly willing to go along with us and help to correct this situation, which is justly causing dissatisfaction everywhere all over the United States.

I do not believe that any Member of this Congress can go home and get the people of his district to indorse the policy of allowing public officials to draw more than one salary at a time. It is not just. It is not right. We have 8,000,000 men, heads of families, now walking the streets to-day without jobs, hungry, if you please, with big officials here drawing \$6,000 retired pay and then in addition drawing a Government salary of \$7,500 to \$10,000 per annum, and you are going to have a bill brought in here next week to reduce all Federal salaries above \$2,000, and all of you are going to vote for it.

There are a few of you possibly who will dare vote against it, but most of you will support the reductions. You can not afford to vote against it. You are going to pass the bill by an overwhelming vote and reduce all salaries in this country above \$2,000, and the President will not dare not to take his medicine along with the balance of us, nor will the Justices of the Supreme Court dare not to make the same sacrifice with all the rest of us. Anyway, we will try them out.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I want the gentleman to understand he is not speaking for me when he is talking about reducing the salaries of poor postmen who are already underpaid.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not mention poor postmen. I am talking about reducing the big bugs, not the little ones. I do not want to reduce any salaries under \$2,000, but I want to get at the big fellows at the top who are drawing two and three salaries.

We must reduce the expenses of this Government. I have been fighting here, earnestly and uncompromisingly, for 15 years to stop the waste, extravagance, and graft in Government bureaus and departments. I have been fighting to abolish useless bureaus. I have been fighting to consolidate departments, bureaus, and commissions, and to eliminate wasteful overhead now existing everywhere.

But every time the crisis is reached, and the crucial test comes, when we are to deny appropriations that the bureaus could get along without, there will be found here and there some friends of the surplus employees who ought to be taken off of the pay roll, who will get on the floor and make a strenuous fight to continue the appropriations, and they are usually continued. And real economies are not effected. And the spending goes on, and the deficits grow larger and larger.

We must not permit this amendment to pass. We must not allow these double salaries to continue. The provision that will stop double salaries was written into this bill by the Committee on Appropriations, composed of 35 earnest Members of this House. Let us vote down the amendment to strike it out.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOYLAN) there were—ayes 30, noes, 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY
MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

For surgeon's necessities for vessels in commission, navy yards, naval stations, and Marine Corps; and for the civil establishment at the several naval hospitals, navy yards, naval medical supply depots, Naval Medical School and dispensary, Washington, and Naval Academy; for tolls and ferriages; purchase of books and stationery; hygienic and sanitary investigation and illustration; sanitary, hygienic, administrative, and special instruction, including the issuing of naval medical bulletins and supplements; purchase and repairs of nonpassenger-carrying wagons, automobile ambulances, and harness; purchase of and feed for horses and cows; maintenance, repair, and operation of three passenger-carrying motor vehicles for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., and of one motor-propelled vehicle for official use only for the medical officer on out-patient medical service at the Naval Academy; trees, plants, care of grounds, garden tools, and seeds; incidental articles for the Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks; washing for medical department at Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks, dispensaries at navy yards and naval stations, and ships; and for minor repairs on buildings and grounds of the United States Naval Medical School and naval medical supply depots; rent of rooms for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., not to exceed \$1,200; for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast, including supernumeraries held for transfer to the Government Hospital for the Insane; for dental outfits and dental material; and all other necessary contingent expenses; in all, \$1,840,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the schedule of wages for civil employees in the field service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$200,000.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out \$200,000. I want to keep the record straight after the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. He apparently fails to realize that the retirement pay of regular Navy and Army officers is in fact considered as a part of their compensation when on active duty. When salaries were being raised in Federal and municipal governments and in private institutions the salaries of this personnel were not increased. While in the active service Army and Navy officers have to move all over the world, with their furniture and baggage and families, and in many cases have to send the children to private schools because public schools are not available. I do not believe that the gentleman from Texas would desire to support himself and family on some of the salaries of the Army and Navy officers, even if he did not have some of the unusual expenses by reason of changing the station of his place of employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval lighter-than-air base, Sunnyvale, Calif.: To continue construction and improvements as authorized by the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base, near Sunnyvale, Calif., in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon," approved February 12, 1931, in addition to the contract authorization contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1931, approved March 4, 1931, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of quarters for commissioned officers to cost in excess of the respective limits fixed by law for quarters for commissioned officers of corresponding rank in the Army.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DARROW: On page 39, after line 4, insert a separate paragraph, as follows:

"Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: To continue construction of the public works authorized by the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes,' approved February 12, 1932 (46 Stat. 1091), subject to the limit of cost fixed by such act, the Secretary of the Navy is au-

thorized to expend \$1,000,000 from the naval-hospital fund for the buildings, equipment, accessories, and appurtenances authorized by such act, in addition to the expenditures authorized from such fund by such act."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman intend to make his point of order?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think it would be well to have it passed on now if the gentleman prefers.

Mr. DARROW. I would like to have the point of order discussed.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will reserve it if the gentleman desires.

Mr. DARROW. It does seem to me that this point of order is not well taken.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. What authority in law is there for using the Navy hospital fund for the purpose of building this hospital in excess of the sum authorized by the legislative committee, of which the gentleman is a member?

Mr. DARROW. In the act authorizing this construction, which was approved in the last Congress on the 12th of February, 1931, there was an authorization, and also an authorization to take from this fund \$300,000, \$200,000 of which was for the purchase of a site and \$100,000 for the preparation of the plans. The site has been purchased and the plans have been prepared, and it was not a limitation, nor did it in any way indicate that other amounts should not be taken from that item. It does not seem to me in this case, because the authorization has been made, that the point of order would lie against it under those circumstances.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Navy hospital fund is supported by a tax of 20 cents per month collected from the officers and men of the Navy and of the pensions of the inmates of the Naval Home at Philadelphia, Pa., together with the balance of fines and forfeitures imposed by naval courts-martial not needed for transportation, and so forth, of discharged prisoners to their homes.

This amendment would seem to be a diversion.

In the authorization for this hospital the legislative committee provided \$300,000 of the fund to be used for this purpose. There seems to be no authorization for a larger sum to be used. It would appear that the authorization by the legislative committee was necessary, and they expressly fixed the amount at \$300,000—fixing the definite purposes for which it should be used.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin to discuss the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] on yesterday I have given more than passing consideration to the question as to whether the amendment recommended by the Budgetary Office would be in order on the appropriation bill.

My argument will be somewhat elaborate. I wish to call attention first to the existing law, as far as the naval fund is concerned. The question here involved is whether the Treasury of the United States shall be called upon to pay \$900,000 or whether the naval-hospital fund may be substituted to that extent for construction purposes.

All the laws relating to the naval-hospital fund are found collated in the hearings on the Navy appropriation bill of 1926 on pages 821 et seq.

By the bye, this 20 cents per head which the gentleman from Alabama referred to as being the contribution and basis for this naval-hospital fund was enacted at the very beginning of our Government in 1798 and has been the law ever since.

On page 822 of the hearings, where all the laws were collated at the request of the chairman of the committee, to have them embodied for all time, we find this statement:

The acts of February 26, 1811, and July 10, 1832, when later condensed, were reenacted into section 4810 of the Revised Statutes, which stood without change from 1874 until March 4, 1913, when it was reenacted by Congress without change in the original language, except by the addition of a proviso as shown.

I am now reading section 4810, with the added proviso, which was passed on March 4, 1913:

Sec. 4810. The Secretary of the Navy shall procure at suitable places proper sites for Navy hospitals, and if the necessary buildings are not procured with the site, shall cause such to be erected, having due regard to economy, and giving preference to such plans as with most convenience and least cost will admit of subsequent additions, when the funds permit and circumstances require; and shall provide, at one of the establishments, a permanent asylum for disabled and decrepit Navy officers, seamen, and marines.

That was the law up to 1913. The Secretary of the Navy had absolute authority to use any of the naval-hospital fund for the purchase of sites and the construction of buildings without limitation by Congress. The proviso which was adopted in that year is as follows:

Provided, That hereafter no site shall be procured or hospital building erected or extensions to existing hospitals made unless hereafter authorized by Congress.

Again I read:

Provided, That hereafter no site shall be procured or hospital building erected or extensions to existing hospitals made unless hereafter authorized by Congress.

Now, I contend that the Congress did last year provide this definitive proposal to erect a naval hospital at Philadelphia.

There is no denying the fact that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would offer an amendment providing for this work and that \$1,000,000 should be appropriated from the Treasury it would be in order on this appropriation bill. I bottom my whole argument upon the fact that that would be in order.

The question which is very likely troubling the Chair, and also the parliamentary adviser, is whether the fact that in the authorization bill the proviso said that of the above amounts, namely, the full amount of \$3,000,000 for construction purposes, that of the above amounts \$200,000 shall be used for the purchase of land and \$100,000 for the buildings, equipments, accessories, and appurtenance, and so forth, \$300,000 shall be expended from the naval-hospital fund. This amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered seeks to appropriate the additional amount for construction up to \$1,000,000 from the naval hospital fund.

Now, follow me closely. I said a moment ago that I bottom my argument on the fact that it would be in order for the gentleman to offer an amendment providing for an expenditure of \$1,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States for the construction of this hospital. There can be no denying that, because it is authorized. Suppose the gentleman had offered that amendment and that amendment were pending before the committee, and that I, as a Member of the House, offered the amendment proposed by the gentleman as a substitute. Would that amendment, being germane, be in order? That is the one question that is before the House, and I maintain with all the strength I have that it would be in order under the Holman rule. Under what part of the Holman rule do I contend it would be in order? Before I read the Holman rule, let me call attention to the fact that the organic act has placed a limitation of \$300,000 as the amount that shall be used of the naval-hospital fund. Therefore, the Secretary of the Navy would have the right to use the naval-hospital fund upon his own motion for this construction when once the construction is authorized without further ado by Congress. Why? We find at page 823 in the interpretative part of that authorization that that year there was spent for reconstruction \$282,000.

But now I am going back to my original proposal, that it can not be denied that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania had offered an amendment providing for an appropriation from the Treasury of \$1,000,000 for the construction of the naval hospital at Philadelphia, it would have been in order, and I then would be entitled to offer the amendment that he has now offered, which is the budgetary estimate.

Why do I say it would be offered as a germane amendment? The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole just a moment ago gave a very broad construction to the Holman

rule. The proposal, which is now before the committee for consideration, on its face shows that there would be a saving. There would be a saving to the Government of appropriations under the last clause of the Holman rule, which says:

Or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Understand me clearly, the gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment that is in order on this bill providing for the authorization of \$1,000,000 for that construction, and it is in order because it is authorized by law. Then I offer an amendment as proposed by the gentleman providing that \$1,000,000 shall be obtained from the hospital fund. On its face the amendment would be shown to be germane in character, that it was an amendment coming within the third provision of the Holman rule with respect to reductions of money covered by the bill. You can not escape the logic of the argument.

Now, are we going to make this in order by the circuitous proposal that there shall be offered an original proposal that a million dollars shall be paid out of the Treasury for the construction of this naval hospital at Philadelphia and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania will offer his amendment in order to make it in order? Under the case I have suggested, it would be in order. Then, of course, the chairman would have to hold in order the present amendment.

I make a further argument based on the organic act, but I make my strong holding on the fact that this proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a germane amendment to an amendment offered by me or any other Member of the House providing for the appropriation of \$1,000,000 from the Treasury. This would be a clear saving of money, because it would not be out of the Treasury, but it would be out of the naval-hospital fund.

Although the original act said that not more than \$300,000 shall be expended from the naval-hospital fund, that does not prevent Congress, under its rules, from providing for more being spent in that way, because it is not in violation of existing law.

The existing law clearly shows that for construction purposes this money may be paid out of the naval-hospital fund.

For the benefit of the parliamentary adviser I again call his attention to section 4810, with the proviso that was adopted on March 4, 1913, which reads as follows:

Provided, That hereafter no site shall be procured or hospital buildings erected or extensions to existing hospitals made unless hereafter authorized by Congress.

Gentlemen, if it had not been for that cost of \$300,000 there would have been no question whatsoever that this money could have been used from the naval-hospital fund.

In view of the fact that the organic law provides that it may be used without limit and that the third classification of the Holman rule provides that it shall be in order if there is a saving to the Government, I respectfully contend that it is in order for the reasons I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULLER). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken. The Chair can see no connection with the Holman rule. The law which has been referred to as providing for the building of a hospital in Philadelphia was a general law authorizing appropriations for that purpose. In that law it is specifically provided that \$300,000 of the Navy-hospital fund may be used for the purpose of constructing the hospital. Under the amendment offered it is proposed to appropriate \$1,000,000 out of the hospital fund, which changes the law to that extent. The amendment changes existing law and is therefore legislation.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DARROW: On page 39, after line 4, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: To continue construction of the public works authorized by the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction

of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes,' approved February 12, 1931 (46 Stat. 1091), subject to the limit of cost fixed by such act, \$1,000,000."

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to members of the committee, with all the earnestness I have, for the adoption of this amendment.

The increasing urgency for an early start on the construction of the Philadelphia Naval Hospital has become so great that the President of the United States sent a special message to Congress transmitting a supplemental estimate from the Bureau of the Budget to enable the Secretary of the Navy to use \$1,000,000, of the naval-hospital fund for this purpose. Such action was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President of the United States. It is very clear to me this is the most urgent construction required anywhere in the country.

I want to give you, if I may, a brief description of the present hospital buildings. There are 34 in number. They are of a very flimsy wooden-type construction, mostly stucco on wood laths, built for war-time emergencies. They are built on wooden piles, about two feet or two and a half feet from the ground. They have been decaying so rapidly that the sills are rotting away. The buildings are sagging, and in many instances the heating pipes and plumbing have been disconnected. Captain Dennis told me a few days ago that when he visited these buildings in September last, during a heavy rain, he saw the patients, eating in the mess hall with umbrellas over them to keep from getting wet. The buildings being grouped closely together, and because of this flimsy construction, we have there one of the greatest fire hazards which you can conceive. Should a fire break out, the loss of life, I am afraid, would be appalling.

It seems to me a crime and a disgrace for this Government to keep men housed in buildings of that character. I know the committee made a comparison between certain wooden structures at Pensacola, Fla., Parris Island, and Charleston, S. C., but those buildings are mostly one-story and were built of a permanent character as far as wooden buildings can be built, and there is no comparison between conditions there and conditions in Philadelphia.

There are upwards of 465 veterans being treated at this hospital in addition to the Navy personnel. It is the only general and surgical hospital anywhere near this locality for veteran patients as well as for patients of the Navy. The nearest Veterans' Bureau hospital at the present time is at Hartford, Conn., and we must find some place for those who require general and surgical attention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DARROW. Every veterans' organization in the State of Pennsylvania as well as veterans' organizations in near-by States are pleading for this more earnestly, I believe, than anything else. To deny them these facilities and subject those patients to that terrible risk of fire is a crime and a disgrace.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any Army hospital or any veterans' hospital nearer to that at League Island than the Walter Reed Hospital, which gives attention to general hospital patients?

Mr. DARROW. There is not.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is none proposed by the Veterans' Bureau or in course of construction, and it is proposed to utilize some of these beds for veteran patients.

Mr. DARROW. That is true. The reason for combining the two in one hospital is on account of the great economy which can be effected. According to the last report of the Surgeon General of the Navy, and General Hines, of the Veterans' Bureau, it was clearly shown that for general and surgical classes of patients there was a saving of 93 cents per day per man if hospitalized in a naval hospital?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Where is this hospital located in Philadelphia?

Mr. DARROW. The present hospital is in the navy yard. We have purchased a beautiful site of 22 acres and a fraction, facing League Island Park, within about a half mile from the navy yard, where they will always have a beautiful and open recreation space.

The site has been purchased, the plans have been prepared and we are ready to go ahead, and if there is anything that is needed as much as this, I do not know where it is.

I plead with you to grant this appropriation. I had hoped that a point of order would not be made against my first amendment, because the naval-hospital fund is intended for this very purpose and yet, on a point of order, you do not permit it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is that fund sufficiently large to construct this hospital?

Mr. DARROW. The naval-hospital fund at the present time has about \$1,250,000 in it. According to the Surgeon General, there will be an addition to that fund of over \$800,000 during the next fiscal year.

I can not feel that there is any new construction anywhere in the United States the demand for which is at all comparable with this, and the amendment ought to be adopted even if we take the funds from the Treasury of the United States.

I appeal to you in behalf of the veterans who are hospitalized there, and in behalf of the naval patients, to grant this appropriation.

I understand that some naval officer intimated to the committee that this is not essential at this time. I have looked through the hearings and I can not find anything in them to that effect. The Secretary of the Navy has approved this proposal in writing, and while I am a thorough believer in a strong Navy, I can not understand how anyone could be so hard-hearted as to want nothing but ships and men and give no attention to the poor unfortunates who have given their services and have become disabled. I do not see how anyone, even though he may be a high ranking officer in the Navy, could make any such statement, off the record.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could have the Members see the condition of these buildings. I have here photographs of them, showing that the sills have rotted away and that the buildings are in a most deplorable condition. They constitute an extreme fire hazard, and continuous supervision, inspection, and care are necessary to guard against fire. The hospital is usually filled to capacity and the conditions in case of fire present a serious menace to the life of the patients. The complete replacement of the present hospital is a very urgent necessity, and, as construction costs are now so favorable, this is a most opportune time to proceed with its building.

The authorization for the construction of this hospital, enacted on February 12, 1931, provided that \$200,000 for the purchase of the site and \$100,000 for the preparation of plans be made available from naval-hospital fund.

The site has been purchased. It is a tract of 22.1 acres, splendidly located, near the Philadelphia Navy Yard, on Pattison Avenue between Sixteenth and Nineteenth Streets, facing League Island Park, and it is considered an ideal location. The price paid is about \$60,000 below the sum authorized.

The architects' plans have been approved, and within the limits of the authorized appropriation I believe we will obtain the most modern, the most useful, and the most economical hospital building to be had.

Probably I should further emphasize the fact that while this is a naval hospital, officered and manned by naval personnel, it is to a great extent used by disabled veterans under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration. This arrangement is entirely satisfactory and desired by General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, with whom I have been in frequent consultation on this subject. It has the

heartily indorsement and approval of the President, of the Secretary of the Navy, of the Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Our veterans' organizations are urgent in their demand for new, modern, and fireproof facilities, where patients may receive care and treatment with safety and without the threat of fire hazards.

Gentlemen, I am pleading for your support of this amendment. Even with the spirit of economy which all of us wish to practice in face of the present economic conditions, I feel justified in asking your support for this appropriation and feel that such action can not be criticized, for I can not conceive that anyone anywhere would want a member of his family or a sick and disabled veteran or service man treated under conditions now existing at this hospital. This proposal is most meritorious, and I request that it be given your support.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW] has said relative to a supplemental estimate being sent down to the committee is true. The estimate was received after we practically had completed our hearings and were ready to frame the bill. The committee, following the principle which it was understood was applied in the preparation of the original Budget, that no funds would be recommended for undertaking new work, concluded to make no provision for initiating this project.

From a purely naval standpoint the hospital is not required, and its erection is not advocated by the regular administrative officials of the Navy. Admiral Pratt, who is Chief of Operations, stated before our committee that it is not required; and so did the Secretary of the Navy, for that matter.

There are many places in the country that need a permanent hospital just as much as Philadelphia.

The Navy at this time has 5,071 beds in fire-resistant buildings, and on November 11 last the Navy patients numbered 2,514, or about one-half the number of patients for which we have beds in fire-resistant buildings. It is true that the present hospital at Philadelphia is entirely of temporary construction, but this is also true as to Charleston, S. C., Parris Island, S. C., and Pensacola, Fla., while at many other places, as will be seen from the table on page 746 of the hearings, both permanent and temporary facilities exist, the latter being the more commodious, in two or three instances, particularly at Great Lakes, Ill.

There is no more need, from a naval standpoint, to have this hospital for these patients at Philadelphia than at Pensacola or Charleston, S. C., or any of these other places.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not generally accepted that League Island Navy Yard is a live navy yard, whereas Pensacola and Charleston are being considered for abandonment?

Mr. AYRES. No; not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not generally accepted that the Secretary of the Navy has recommended the abandonment of the yard at Charleston?

Mr. AYRES. There has been no suggestion to close Pensacola or to abandon activities at or in the vicinity of Charleston to an extent that would justify closing the hospital there.

Mr. STAFFORD. Charleston is being considered for abandonment, and Pensacola was considered a raid on the Treasury when it was established years back through the efforts of a Senator from that State.

Mr. AYRES. The navy yard is the only activity at Charleston which has been considered for abandonment. The Marine Corps activities at Parris Island are near by. The gentleman will recall, I am sure, that the Navy's flying school is maintained at Pensacola.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Could not these beds be used by the veterans? If you try now to get a veteran in the hospital, they tell you there are 40 or 50 ahead of him.

Mr. AYRES. The larger portion of the patients in these hospitals are veteran patients.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Why could we not have these facilities provided for the veterans? We need them for some of our people in Maryland.

Mr. AYRES. Then I say to the gentleman from Maryland that it should be paid for out of the veterans' fund. The gentleman knows that the Veterans' Bureau is building hospitals all over the United States. Why have the Navy build a hospital for the purpose of housing veterans?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not the fact that the Veterans' Bureau wishes this new building constructed so as to accommodate the veterans, and that they are not planning for any general hospitals for veterans this side of the Allegheny Mountains?

Mr. AYRES. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have made inquiry, and that is the fact.

Mr. AYRES. I have also made inquiry, and I have not found anything to that effect.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Is it not true that there are at the present moment over 600 patients in this fire trap, and would the gentleman be happy if the fire trap burned down and three or four hundred patients were burned to death?

Mr. AYRES. I do not think the gentleman is fair in asking that question.

Mr. BACON. There are over 600 patients there.

Mr. AYRES. If we are going to build a permanent hospital in Philadelphia, then why not build such hospitals at the other places where we have temporary facilities? Of course, I believe that all hospitals should be fireproof, but I must confess that I do not like the idea of waiting until our Treasury is exhausted to launch a replacement program.

I may say further that there was no recommendation on the part of the President relative to this hospital until the bill was practically completed, when all of a sudden it appeared before the committee. It seems to me to be unfair to the rest of the places that claim they should have hospitals of permanent construction. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. DARROW. Is not the gentleman in favor of economy, and by combining the Veterans' Bureau and the naval stations together we save on this one hospital over \$221,000, to the better satisfaction of the veterans and all concerned? It is advocated by the Veterans' Bureau and by the Navy.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The Veterans' Bureau did not approve of it. I will read the language of Doctor TEMPLE last year:

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. McCLINTIC, who has preceded me, spoke at some length of a letter from General Hines written to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I can readily understand why General Hines, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, would not interfere with the administration of the Navy Department by recommending the construction of a naval hospital. In fact, he himself told me that he could not do that. Having said that, I am also thoroughly convinced that he would not interfere with the department in the opposite way by recommending that a naval hospital should not be constructed.

So he did not recommend the construction of this hospital.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Chairman, I only want to testify of my own knowledge to the present condition of this hospital, which would do little credit to the smallest South American republic. It can not be compared to the hospitals, to which reference has been made, which are in a warmer climate. These flimsy, wooden, decayed structures are in a climate where the thermometer sometimes goes to zero.

I can not add anything to what my colleague, Mr. DARROW, has so ably and eloquently said, except to make a plea to

the membership of this House. Philadelphia gave to the United States Government, without the expenditure of a penny, the magnificent site of the navy yard, one of the choicest sections in its future possibilities, because it is at the junction of two great rivers that flow through Philadelphia.

It is true that at any moment, while we speak, a match could set fire to these buildings and two or three hundred patients might be burned to death. I have followed the committee in most of its plans for economy, but I draw the line at this question of health and even life. I think the least we can do for the service men and the faithful employees of the Navy Yard is to build this new building, or rather commence its construction, to furnish adequate facilities to the men whose services deserve so well of their country. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was up for consideration last year I opposed it on the ground that the Veterans' Bureau should be willing to provide the necessary facilities for its own patients. I am the last person who would ever raise my voice against providing hospital facilities for any class that is entitled to the same, but there should be sufficient facilities available to take care of them without using naval hospitals.

There are naval hospitals with sufficient available beds for use at the present time. Everybody knows that naval enlisted men are subject to be transferred from one place to another. Now, I want to call attention to where we are going.

In 1915 the total appropriation for naval purposes, including the amounts allocated for shipbuilding, was \$172,498,000. In 1916 the total was \$186,565,000. Now we are being called upon to appropriate more than \$340,000,000 for next year, which means that expenditures for the upkeep of this branch of our Government has doubled, and apparently there is no desire upon the part of this House to reduce expenditures further. As long as the naval hospitals have sufficient facilities to take care of their own men, that ought to be sufficient, and further, that is the reason General Hines refused to favorably approve this particular piece of legislation when it was under consideration last year. I am in favor of some economy at some place somewhere, and I am hoping that this House will at least look at this subject from the standpoint of reason and stop wasting the taxpayers' money.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to complete this bill if it takes until 10 or 11 o'clock to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that debate do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINTHICUM) there were—ayes 70, noes 11.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighteen Members, a quorum.

The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were—ayes 75, noes 72.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DARROW and Mr. AYRES to act as tellers.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval radio and radio-compass stations: Improvement of power plant, Darlen, Canal Zone, and improvement of building No. 1, Destruction Island, Wash., \$40,000.

Mr. SNOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], that technically I shall speak somewhat out of order. I am anxious to leave the Chamber, and I have one or two observations to make on a paragraph of the bill that has not yet been reached. I hope no objection will be raised under the circumstances, as I shall be very brief.

An appropriation bill is solely for the purpose of appropriating money for the maintenance of the various Government departments and activities and nothing else.

Consequently, this paragraph on page 39 of the bill authorizing the President to sell, lease, or cease to operate certain naval shore properties does not belong in this bill. It is clearly an attempt to legislate and is not related to the present appropriation.

In other words, it is a subterfuge and a left-handed way of legislating. The question of closing the navy yards at New Orleans, Charleston, S. C., Boston, Mass., Kittery, Me., and various other places is a matter of grave concern.

In the name of a sensible-sized Navy, adequate to protect our country in case of war, and also in the name of thousands of employees who would be thrown out of employment in these most distressing times if this paragraph is not stricken from the bill, I ask the membership of this House to stop and ponder before voting on this critically important matter.

Perhaps there is merit in the proposal, but by all means let it be considered carefully and in an orderly legislative manner before any final action is taken here in this House of Representatives.

Let the proponents introduce a bill calling for this elimination, let it be referred to a proper committee who will have complete and full hearings, and then report to the House. We will then have the advantage of reading the hearings, obtaining the best thought of the committee members who will have given the matter careful thought and study, and will then—and not until then—be in a position to vote intelligently on the proposition.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President is authorized to sell, lease, or cease operating such naval shore property as the Secretary of the Navy may certify to him is no longer required or needed for naval purposes, and appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of such action shall not be used for any other purposes, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order beginning in line 9 on page 39, upon the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, in order to save any controversy, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

AVIATION, NAVY

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1932, \$949,900; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, fleet air bases, fleet and all other aviation activities, accident prevention, testing laboratories, for overhauling of planes, and for the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, \$13,578,805, including \$153,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults and including not to exceed \$175,000 for the procurement of helium, and such sum shall be transferred to and made available to the Bureau of Mines on July 1, 1932; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, including the payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed, \$2,210,000; for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization carried in the Navy appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932 for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts and accessories, \$7,200,000; toward the construction of the rigid airships as provided in the act authorizing construction of aircraft, etc., approved June 24, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 749a), and subject to the

contractual conditions stipulated as to such rigid airships in the act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year 1929, \$1,450,000; in all, \$25,388,705; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to Group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,192,145: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Navy may, prior to July 1, 1934, enter into contracts for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts and accessories, to an amount not in excess of \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coast of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$500.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am in sympathy with the efforts of the subcommittee to complete the reading and consideration of the pending Navy appropriation bill this afternoon, and I shall not use all the time to which I am entitled, to the end that a final vote on the pending appropriation bill may not be delayed.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] referred to an hysteria of economy that was sweeping over the Nation. I think it is regrettable that this so-called economy complex, mania, hysteria, or psychological condition did not infect and dominate the American people and the Republican national administration that have been in charge of our Government for the last 11 years. If the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations had been inoculated with this economy virus we would not be facing a bankrupt Treasury. If President Hoover and his Republican predecessors had exercised a little economy and their much advertised governmental efficiency and had not lulled the American people into a fictitious prosperity and into a false sense of security, much of the evil effects of this depression could have been avoided.

The measure we are considering carries an appropriation of approximately \$340,000,000 for the support of the Navy Department for the approaching fiscal year. Within the last 11 years we have appropriated \$4,468,445,868 for the support of our War Department or Military Establishment, an average annual expense for military purposes of \$406,222,351. In the same 11 years we appropriated \$4,157,327,827 for our Navy, approximately \$378,000,000 annually. In these last 11 years our combined appropriations for the War and Navy Departments aggregated \$8,625,773,695, or approximately \$784,000,000 annually for the support of our Army and Navy.

These enormous expenditures can only be met by laying heavy tax burdens on the backs of the American people who are already bending beneath an unbearable load. It is not my purpose at this time to analyze and discuss these appropriations for the support of our Military and Naval Establishments, further than to say that while many of the expenditures may have been justified, undoubtedly a very considerable proportion of the aggregate outlay represented an unwise and unnecessary expenditure.

The all-important issue before the American people is the reduction of taxation and expenses of Government. I have risen to suggest that a way must be found to reduce the expenses of our Government, otherwise our free institutions can not endure. In this enlightened age the people of the United States and other civilized nations should be able to formulate a policy that will relieve a tax-burdened world of the present excessive taxation for military and naval purposes. It is not to the credit of the American people or the nations overseas that they have not found a sane and sensible method of reducing our Naval and Military Establishments to the point where they will not constitute a burden on the citizenry of the great nations that control the destinies of the world.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman referred to a statement which I made yesterday.

Mr. LOZIER. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In this hysteria and mania of economy to which I referred there is not contemplated 5 cents reduction in the items to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. LOZIER. I am sure the gentleman from New York favors genuine economy and a substantial reduction in the expenses of Government. As an able and useful public servant he is no doubt convinced that prodigality or waste in expenditures of public funds can not be justified or defended. The well-being of the Nation should be our first concern.

We are drifting into a period of competitive naval construction, which will ultimately carry with it a substantial increase in the strength of our Military Establishment and in a few years double or treble our present expenditures of these two departments. In this connection may I say that if the bill granting independence to the Philippine Islands fails to become a law, and if their independence is denied or indefinitely delayed, such action on our part will make it absolutely imperative that we expend not only hundreds of millions but at least a billion dollars annually on our Navy. From a diligent study of the Philippine problem I am convinced that the permanent retention of these far-away possessions, or our exercise of sovereignty over them for 25 or 50 years, will necessitate the construction of a Navy so large and expensive as to shock the national conscience and drive our Government dangerously close to bankruptcy and economic disaster.

The forces favoring our permanent retention of the Philippines or withholding independence for an indefinite period are not asleep at the switch but are exerting every possible influence to delay and ultimately defeat the enactment of any measure designed to fulfill our national covenants and grant independence to these islands which by the fickle fortunes of war were left on our doorstep. I indulge the earnest hope that the influence of every Member of the House who recently voted for the Philippine independence measure may be exerted to the uttermost, within the limits of right and propriety, to secure favorable action in the Senate on the Hare bill providing for the withdrawal of our flag from the Orient.

We must not be drawn into a naval building contest which I believe to be inevitable unless we promptly withdraw our flag from the Philippines. By such action we will promote the interests of the American people and the welfare of our insular wards.

Now is the opportune time to withdraw our sovereignty from the Philippines. The dream of territorial expansion, the fever of national aggrandizement, the vision of gold from exploitation of Philippine resources, the piping hours of jubilee and dalliance are at an end. Prudence, reason, common sense, expediency, and sound public policy emphasize the importance of fulfilling our commitments, and withdrawing our flag from the Philippines in the immediate future.

To paraphrase the language of Horace, by withdrawing from the Philippines, thereby contributing to the creation and stabilization of the Filipino republic, we will have reared for our own people and Nation a monument more lasting than brass, more enduring than bronze or marble, more majestic than the Parthenon or Temple of Hadrian in their pristine splendor, and more regal and sublime than the ancient pyramids, which neither the wasting shower, the unavailing north wind, or an innumerable succession of years, and the flight of seasons shall be able to demolish.

Both the American and the Filipino are creatures of the same Benevolent and Infinite Father, in whose likeness and similitude each was made. The finger of Deity touched a block of Parian marble, and the American came forth. The same Omniscient Power breathed on a block of brown granite, and out of it sprang the Filipino. Each may invoke His

unstinted bounty; each may claim His all-sufficient protection; each may share in the covenant of grace He gave to a misguided and self-centered world, and they may enjoy alike the birthright of freedom, and the inalienable right to work out, each his own destiny, free from the dominion or control of the other.

In meeting our obligations to withdraw from the Philippines we have experienced a flux of promises and a paucity of performance, the inevitable effect of which will be to benumb our sense of obligation and make callous and irresponsible our national conscience. It is quite evident that we have approached the Philippine problem with laggard, halting, and tardy-gaited feet. The movement for Philippine independence is flowing like a mighty river, with ever-increasing volume and momentum, toward the great ocean of realization. Not infrequently the duration of an illness is in proportion to the length of the patient's purse. And some would protract our stay in the Philippines because of the rich financial rewards that will come to a few of our people from commercial ventures in the Philippines.

Somewhere I have read of a looking-glass kept in a heathen temple that makes beautiful things appear deformed and deformed things appear beautiful. Methinks some of my colleagues, in some niche or corner of their otherwise well-balanced brains, have a mirror of this kind into which they look when considering the Philippine problem, and from which they see reflected the Filipino, of pigmy stature, grotesquely caparisoned, and wholly incapable of self-government, while in this same trick mirror they visualize "Uncle Sam" as a benevolent lord, guardian angel, and wet nurse of the Filipino people, and pretend to see the dire calamities that will overtake the native inhabitants if they are granted the poor but God-given privilege of managing their affairs, free from the guiding hand and fatherly protection of the United States Government.

Our century and a half of national life is but a moment in the tideless sweep of time. "A thousand years scarce serve to form a state; an hour may lay it in the dust." Our longevity as a nation will depend on how sacredly we hold to the high ideals on which our institutions are builded. Our Republic is not immune from the insidious process of decay, nor from the relentless forces of destruction which like rust eats its way ruthlessly through massive steel beam and column. Turn to the pages of history and learn that oblivion enshrouds not only illustrious persons but puissant nations. A Roman poet gave expression to this great truth when he said:

The loftiest pine is oftenest agitated by the winds—high towers rush to the earth with heavier fall, and the lightning most frequently strikes the highest mountain.

And Sallust tells us:

Everything rises but to fall, and increases but to decay.

Nations are no exception to this ruthless rule. Only by a scrupulous adherence to our national ideals can we successfully resist the insidious forces of destruction that have disintegrated world powers in the past.

It is a great thing for Americans to sit down by themselves occasionally, take stock, and learn their own shortcomings. Colton said:

It is with nations as with individuals—those who know the least of others think the highest of themselves; for the whole family of pride and ignorance are incestuous and mutually beget each other.

Some one has said that governments of the world are like a stream that rolls under us; men are only bubbles that rise on its surface; some are brighter and larger, and sparkle longer in the sun than others; but all must break, whilst the mighty current rolls on in its wonted majesty. And friends, what are we that we should vainly boast our mastery in the science of government? What are we that we should refuse to recognize in others the aptitude for efficient self-government that we claim to possess? What assurance have we that the bubble that typifies our national life may not be punctured and collapse long before the bubble of Filipino destiny disappears in the wreck wrought by the onrushing centuries?

Ours is the most resourceful and puissant Nation on the globe; but our power, great as it may be, is not sufficient to prevent the ultimate establishment of a republic in the Philippines. In their struggle for independence, Providence is fighting on the side of the Filipinos. There is no instance in the history of the world where 13,000,000 people, as well qualified for governing themselves as the Filipinos, have ever lost their battle for independence. Sometimes destiny may travel with laggard footsteps, but ultimately he crowns with victory the efforts of every upstanding, forward-looking race to achieve independence. In the language of Morier—

The decrees of Providence are inscrutable. In spite of man's shortsighted endeavors to dispose of events according to his own wishes and his own purposes, there is an intelligence beyond his reason which holds the scales of justice in spite of his puny efforts.

And this wonder-working Providence will in the near future bring independence to the Philippines. Liberty withheld will poison the fountains of Filipino life and breed ever-increasing discontent among the inhabitants as they bite the political chains that bind them. We are not justified in longer withholding independence from the Filipinos. We should no longer stop the throats of the Filipinos who are pleading for independence and the God-given right to solve their own problems and live under laws of their own enactment.

We must once and for all time forego the exercise of sovereignty over the Philippines. We should restore the government of these islands to the race that inhabits and owns them. This act of renunciation is not incompatible with our national interests. Let us actively and unselfishly assist the Filipinos in establishing and maintaining a sister republic, motivated and inspired by the high ideals that underlie, permeate, and vitalize our free institutions, to the end that the American and Filipino Republics may go down the ages arm in arm, each a lamp and light to the other's feet. With our Republic for a pattern, and animated by our accomplishments and our high ideals in our dealings with other nations, the Filipino republic will prosper without having to fertilize her tree of liberty with the blood of her patriots. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is getting late in the day. There is not a quorum present, and I want to call the attention of the Members of the House who are present to the fact that it would be well for them to remain if we are going to complete the bill to-day, because I intend, if I can obtain recognition, to offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to further consider it and report it back with a 10 per cent total reduction.

Since the Senate has indicated that it is going to follow this 10 per cent arbitrary reduction on all of the appropriation bills which we send over there, and since the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations indicates he is going to swallow those reductions without further consideration, if this reduction is to come, let it come from the House, so that when the bill is finally passed with a 10 per cent reduction we will pass it after a careful consideration of all of the items involved under the 5-minute rule. It is poor economy from the standpoint of real economy for the Committee on Appropriations of this House to hold hearings and spend hours and days considering a very voluminous bill of this nature, involving so much money, and then have the membership remain on the floor of the House, as we have to-day, carefully going over each and every item under the 5-minute rule, and send the bill to the Senate to be arbitrarily reduced 10 per cent, without a record roll-call vote on many important appropriations, and then expect the House of Representatives to rubber stamp the Senate amendments under suspension of the rules, with only 40 minutes' consideration.

If the arbitrary additional reduction is to be made in order to enhance the political standing of some who would destroy some of the essential functions of the Government by a false and fake economy, and since the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations indicates he will support the 10 per cent reduction if it is incorporated in this bill in the

Senate and swallow it as he did the 10 per cent reduction on the Interior Department appropriation bill, let us, in the name of orderly procedure, in keeping with the authority and responsibility vested in us under the Constitution, take our part in the enactment of this appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman has reached the end of his sentence, I would like to ask him to yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman had something to say about my position as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, with reference, I assume, to the action taken with reference to the Interior Department appropriation bill. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that on a record vote this House approved that action by a vote of 263 to 42.

Mr. SCHAFER. I did not approve of that action then and I do not now. I have also talked with many Members who followed the gentleman from Tennessee who would not do it again. If the gentleman would have made his eloquent political speech in the name of economy and asked the House to vote that the sun shall rise at 7 o'clock a. m. each day in the future and that the moon shall rise at 7 o'clock p. m. each evening; if one of the many Senate amendments to the Interior appropriations bill so provided, no doubt the roll call would have been the same. You might fool some of the people some of the time, but you can not all of the time.

If you could take that roll-call vote over again to-day, I know you would not even get a majority to follow the strange and unusual procedure.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman has reached the end of his second sentence, I would like to ask him another question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman would practice a little more economy, he would represent the taxpayers of his district. I am sure that his district, like my district and every other district in the United States, wants to see these expenditures cut down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Objection was made.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ACADEMY

Pay, Naval Academy—pay for professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, \$269,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$36,500 shall be paid for masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of bringing a situation to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee. I find that the military appropriation bill provides \$46,561, as is found on page 21 of the appropriation bill, for the payment of salaries of professors in the Military Academy. Then on page 18 of last year's naval appropriation bill I find that the sum was \$290,000. In view of the fact that the Military Academy takes care of two appointees for each Senator and each Member of the House, and the Naval Academy takes care of only three, I can not understand why it is necessary to appropriate \$290,000 to take care of teachers in one of these institutions and only \$46,000 in the other. I respectfully ask somebody to tell us why these inequalities seem to exist.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Was the gentleman reading from this year's Army appropriation bill or last year's Army appropriation bill?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am reading from last year's Army appropriation bill. I understand that both of these bills have been reduced in a slight percentage, but the ratio remains the same. It does seem to me that if we are

interested in economy, and we base this upon the number of appointees that the House Members have, there is something radically wrong, and I would like some one who has the facts to give them to the committee.

Mr. AYRES. I will state to the gentleman that I can not speak as to the West Point proposition.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will be glad to get information from some one.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the difference arise from the fact that at the Military Academy they employ officers who are assigned to duty as teachers and instructors rather than employing civilian teachers and instructors?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not know how far the gentleman's statement is accurate, but I do know that in the Naval Academy they possibly employ as many officers as they do in the Military Academy.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, they have more at the Naval Academy.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think they have about eight civilian instructors at West Point and the rest are Army officers.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman enlighten the committee as to why this enormous inconsistency exists with respect to the appropriations that are made to take care of teachers in both of these institutions?

Mr. BARBOUR. I am not familiar with the situation at the Naval Academy, but I understand they employ a great many more civilians there.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It seems to me the committee ought to be furnished with the facts. It seems to me somebody ought to know just why this inconsistency exists.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last March, after the adjournment of Congress, as a member of the Board of Visitors, that question arose, and it was called to our attention that at the Naval Academy they have many more civilian instructors than they have at the Military Academy.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. On that point I want to say that the appropriation for civilian employees at the Naval Academy is \$649,000 against the sum of \$276,000 at the Military Academy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. If these figures are correct then approximately three times more is necessary to take care of the civilian employees at Annapolis than at the Military Academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, there are stationed at the Military Academy two troops of enlisted men, and they perform services that are performed by civilians at the Naval Academy.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. There are about 450 civilians at the Military Academy and between 1,100 and 1,200 soldiers at the Military Academy besides the officers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say that upon a very thorough investigation at the Military Academy, in company with the gentleman from South Carolina, our esteemed chairman of the committee [Mr. McSWAIN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COCHRAN], we saw no surplusage as far as civilian employees were concerned.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have no criticism to offer of the appropriation made to take care of these duties at the Military Academy, but I can not understand why it requires nearly three times as much to take care of the same number of employees at Annapolis.

Mr. FISH. Why does it?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I would like to know.

Mr. FISH. Who is going to answer?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not know. I have asked the chairman of the subcommittee and the different members of the committee, but up to the present time I have not been able to get any information.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The reason these figures appear to give the Naval Academy all the worst of it is because the Naval Academy employs a great many less officers of the line of the Navy as instructors than West Point for its languages and higher studies—

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman is in error. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRITTEN. Let me finish my statement. With respect to some of the higher studies we use nothing but civilian instructors at the Naval Academy, while the Military Academy at West Point does not have this expense at all. If the gentleman will add the civilian instructors to the officer instructors at both institutions, he will find there are fewer instructors per student at the Naval Academy to-day than there are at West Point. I am sure about this.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman is in error. I think there are many more instructors, taking into consideration the number of men that are employed as swordsmen, tutors, athletic directors, and various kinds of assistants.

Mr. BRITTEN. I have just inquired of the Navy Department, and that is the reason I am answering the gentleman in this way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: Page 42, line 1, after the word "librarian," strike out "\$269,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that we will be unable to finish the consideration of the bill this evening. I move, therefore, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11452, the Navy Department appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. MAY (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for the balance of the week, on account of important business.

Mrs. OWEN, for one week, on account of important business.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

STATE OF MAINE,

Augusta, April 19, 1932.

To the honorable the SPEAKER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions of the attached resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, I have the honor to forward you herewith a certified and fully authenticated copy of a resolution titled as follows:

"A resolve ratifying proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress."

The same was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine on April 1, A. D. 1932.

Respectfully,

EDGAR C. SMITH, Secretary of State.

INSURANCE CORPORATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3584) entitled "An act to require all insurance corporations formed under the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to maintain their principal offices and places of business within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia has no objection to this resolution.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SOLDIERS' ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following speech by myself on the subject of the bonus:

SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR., IN RADIO DEBATE WITH HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, TUESDAY EVENING, APRIL 19, 1932

I am glad of this opportunity to discuss over the radio with my good friend, colleague, and comrade in arms, WRIGHT PATMAN, in a calm and deliberate manner, without prejudice of any kind, the already much and hotly debated question of the so-called bonus payment to the veterans of the World War.

For some 12 years past as a Member of the House of Representatives I have raised my voice and given my vote freely and openly for the benefit of the disabled veterans and of all other veterans. I was among the first to urge the creation of a Veterans' Legislative Committee in the House of Representatives and participated to the best of my ability in the original fight for adjusted compensation for the veterans, and I even voted to override the veto of a President of my own party, and only last year urged the payment of loans up to 50 per cent on the face value of the adjusted-service certificates.

I need no alibi or no defense of my record in behalf of justice, not charity, to the veterans and for all kinds of beneficial legislation sought by the three great veterans' organizations, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, the first two of which I am proud to be a member.

There is room for differences of opinion among veterans, and it is just and right that there should be, as the veterans merely represent a cross section of the American people who served in the armed forces of the United States in a great national emergency.

I am not unmindful of the suffering and privation among the unemployed veterans and believe that preference should be given them in obtaining positions and that the comprehensive and constructive campaign or drive of the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans to provide work and jobs should be encouraged and supported in every way by the American public.

The veterans want jobs, not charity or doles, and I will gladly support a bond issue of \$500,000,000 to provide for needed highway construction, the completion of the Federal program for post offices already allocated but not appropriated for, and for other necessary public works, with a proviso that unemployed veterans be given preference on all new construction work.

It is estimated that appropriations for the fiscal year of 1932 will approximate \$1,127,935,000 for veterans' relief purposes, or over \$3,000,000 a day, or more than 25 per cent of our total Federal expenditures, including debt charges of \$600,000,000. Veterans' relief is by far the largest single item in our Budget, and if national defense and interest on debts are excluded, it amounts to 40 per cent of all our Federal Government expenditures.

No sane person can deny that the Government has been extremely liberal, generous, and fair in its treatment of its veterans, particularly when compared with what other countries, such as England, France, or Italy, have done for their soldiers.

It is true that we are in an economic crisis far more serious to the welfare, interests, happiness, and security of the American people than during the World War. Uncle Sam has always fulfilled every obligation to its veterans of all its wars, and has never given a bad check and never will. If it were a fact that the Federal Government owes any money to the veterans, ways and means should be found to pay it now. Obligations of the Government must be paid in full in both good and bad times. Promises and pledges must be kept to veterans as well as to all other citizens.

I, however, deny most emphatically that the Federal Government owes one red cent to any veteran at this time, either directly or indirectly, or has made any implied promise to pay in cash any part of the adjusted-service certificates this year, next year, or any time before 1945. For some incomprehensible reason many misguided veterans take it for granted and firmly believe that they

are owed a debt by the Government, which they seem to think has turned a cold shoulder to them and refuses to pay what is their due.

It is utterly inconceivable that the Congress will approve the various suggestions made to start the printing presses going and issue depreciated currency to pay in cash the adjusted-service certificates during the present economic emergency. Such action by Congress would seriously affect every American household and impair the value of wages, real estate, insurance policies, bonds and other securities, and deposits in savings banks belonging to industrious and thrifty American wage earners. Any tampering with the American dollar, which is the only thing left that retains its value, by issuing two billions in paper currency will be injurious to the public credit and destructive of what remains of economic confidence, and will prolong both the depression and unemployment.

It is, in the last analysis, the same old fight of soft money against sound money. We are already in the midst of a severe panic, but if the proposed financial heresy of printing two more billions of paper money is carried out it will mean the collapse of the dollar and American credit that will make the present panic look like a new-born babe.

The proposal to pay adjusted-service certificates in United States bank notes, as suggested by Representative PATMAN, backed by 40 per cent gold, would exhaust our gold reserves, cause the flight of gold to France and other foreign countries, and probably shove us off the gold standard within six months, and be detrimental to the welfare of the Nation and ruinous to credit stability.

It is the paramount duty of the Congress of the United States to maintain the credit of the Nation, balance the Budget, and reduce governmental expenditures and thereby restore economic faith among our people, without which the depression will become worse and unemployment increase.

I appeal to all veterans not to insist on extravagant demands upon the Public Treasury at this time, when the Congress is struggling to balance the Budget and restore economic confidence. I take this occasion to seriously warn all veterans that their demand for additional compensation to the able-bodied veterans during the present crisis is causing serious public resentment and will jeopardize the benefits provided by law for the disabled veterans and the passage of the pending legislation for widows and orphans. A definite movement is under way to reduce the amount of relief already provided by Congress for the disabled veterans in a desperate effort to balance the Budget, and it is a most unwise policy for any group of veterans to alienate the support of the public by tremendous demands for cash payments to the able-bodied veterans at this time. The taxpayers throughout the Nation are on the verge of a political revolt; and while they do not begrudge the disabled veterans their just dues, they are opposed to further drains on the Treasury for any group or any section of the country.

It is not easy for me to oppose any claims of the veterans for monetary relief in this period of unemployment and distress, yet, believing firmly as I do, that any attempt to pay \$2,400,000,000 to the veterans would undo all the efforts of the Government to balance the Budget and scrap all ideas of governmental economy, and be harmful to our financial credit at home and abroad and destructive of the economic welfare of the great mass of American wage earners, there is no other course for me to take except to uphold, without fear or favor, what I honestly deem to be the best interests of all the American people in preserving the integrity of the gold standard and preventing the issue of depreciated currency as a temporary expedient, which will bring ruin and disaster in its wake, as it has done in Russia and Germany and in every other country where it has been tried since the French Revolution, 140 years ago, when worthless paper currency, known to history as "assignats," were issued in vast quantities. I know of no more dangerous precedent to establish than to start the printing presses going and issue several billions of dollars to the veterans or any other group among the American people, whether they be farmers who are burdened with debts or factory workers who are unemployed.

Once Congress starts in, by a mere majority vote, to change the value of money under political pressure, whether of the veterans or any other group, it will be the beginning of the end of American currency. The value of the dollar might drop to 50 cents or even 30 cents if we go off the gold standard. If Congress starts in trying to manipulate the dollar, or pay obligations of the Government through paper currency, it may mean not only severe depreciation of our money but that it is headed for destruction.

There is no more valid reason to print two billions of new currency for the able-bodied veterans than to balance the Budget by new note issues. Why spend months haggling over various kinds of new taxes, when all that is necessary is to buy a few gallons of oil and a few bales of bank-note paper and print sufficient paper currency? What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Why argue over a program of national economy and reduction of wages; it is much easier to rely on the printing presses. Why worry over an expensive road construction and public-building program when new bank notes can be issued into the billions?

Why strive over the cost of national defense and talk of reducing the Army and Navy and closing the navy yards? Why not solve all the problems of the farmers by issuing nine billions in paper currency as suggested by one of their ultraradical organizations? There is no end to the absurdity of issuing fiat money. It is always the last resort of bankrupt nations and has never

failed to end in a financial and economic catastrophe. Instead of reviving business it would produce runs on banks, as everyone would want gold instead of fiat money or congressional or political bank notes. I know of nothing that would prostrate business quicker or more surely.

At my request, the Veterans' Administration furnished me to-day with the following astounding data relative to the number of veterans of the World War who are receiving every month monetary relief from the Treasury of the United States. The sums received by the veterans range from \$8 to \$100, except for special awards to the blinded, amounting to \$150, and to the doubled permanently disabled, amounting to \$200. There are to-day 322,825 World War veterans receiving disability compensation and 353,744 receiving disability allowance for injuries or diseases that have no connection with war service.

There are also 6,451 disabled emergency officers receiving retirement pay, of which 25 per cent are doctors. In addition, 98,401 dependents of World War veterans, making a total of 781,421 World War veterans and dependents of veterans receiving financial relief from the Government of the United States.

There has been much loose talk over the vote of Congress to set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with a \$2,000,000,000 credit in order, in this emergency, to make loans to banks, railroads, building and loan associations, and certain farm cooperatives. In the first place, the Congress is not giving away anything; it is merely proposing to extend credit and loans on adequate security, primarily to small banks, on behalf of the small-town grocer, butcher, dairyman, or farmer. Few, if any, of the big banks have failed or are in financial trouble. The record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shows that it has extended loans as of April 19, 1932, to 1,520 banks. Ninety-two per cent of these loans have been made in cities of less than 100,000 population and 76 per cent in cities of less than 10,000.

There is no chance whatever of the adjusted-service certificate bill becoming law over the President's veto. In my opinion, the bill will not receive a majority in Congress, nor a majority of the veterans in Congress.

It is, however, true that there are great numbers of unemployed veterans, and much hardship and suffering among them, and it is most unjust to attempt to deceive them by holding out the hope of cash payments at this time.

I am in favor of reducing the interest on the adjusted-service certificates to 3 per cent and have introduced a bill to this effect.

No Member of Congress can vote to expend public funds to the amount of \$2,400,000,000 to able-bodied veterans and at the same time represent to his people back home that he has carried out their demands for governmental economy. The veterans should not in this emergency expect individual Members of Congress who have the interest of the veterans and the public at heart to vote for any governmental expenditures that are not due or absolutely necessary.

Those Members of Congress who for selfish, political purposes propose to vote for the so-called bonus and then, if the bill passes, do an about-face and uphold the President's assured veto will be doing a cowardly political act and a distinct disservice to the veterans by holding out false hopes for cash payments, when none exist, during the present economic crisis and national emergency.

We are already confronted with a deficit of nearly \$3,000,000,000 and with steadily decreasing Federal income. At this very moment we are faced with the difficulty of finding new sources of revenue, and it may be necessary to reduce the salaries of men and women in the employ of the Government. No individual has ever found a way of pulling himself up by the bootstraps, nor has any nation overcome depression by printing vast quantities of paper money without strangling public credit and confidence and within a short time creating a vicious financial and monetary circle that wrecks trade and commerce, with disastrous consequence to the rich and poor alike, thereby increasing human misery and distress and adding more unfortunates to the already huge number of unemployed.

The main reason I oppose the payment of \$2,400,000,000 in unsupported paper currency to the veterans at this time is my firm conviction that it would cause runs on banks, destroy faith in our financial system, and virtually bankrupt the credit of the Federal Government.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that next Calendar Wednesday business be made in order on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF JOSEPH WARREN KEIFER

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House of the death of J. Warren Keifer at Springfield, Ohio, on this morning. He was 96 years of age. He was formerly a Speaker of this House, just 50 years ago, in the Forty-seventh Congress. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following minute be spread upon the record of the House of Representatives:

Hon. Joseph Warren Keifer died in Springfield, Ohio, April 22, 1932. On January 30, 1932, he reached the venerable age of 96 years. For seven terms he was a Member of this House; for one term (the Forty-seventh Congress) its Speaker. His services terminated with the Sixty-first Congress. He was a brave and distinguished soldier. For "gallant and meritorious service" in the Civil War he was made a brigadier general, and in the same war, having been wounded four times in battle, was made a major general of volunteers. In the Spanish-American War he was commissioned and served as a major general of volunteers side by side with Gen. Joe Wheeler and Gen. Fitzhugh Lee. He was a statesman, a scholar, an author, and a patriot. His nearly five score years of life were filled with useful deeds of kindness, of courage, and of fidelity to his country and to his fellow men, and he has passed into history honored and beloved.

Resolved, That in honor of the distinguished dead the House do now adjourn.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I know of no precedent for adjournment on account of the death of an ex-Member.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I am informed by the former Clerk of the House that there are several precedents.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not informed, but understands that similar resolutions have been passed by the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keifer having been an ex-Speaker of the House, I withdraw the objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), in pursuance to the resolution, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 23, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

534. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 20, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of the harbor at Grand Marais, Minn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

535. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 19, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Great Sodus Bay Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McKEOWN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10593. A bill to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CONDON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11057. A bill to amend section 129 of the Criminal Code of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTAGUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 418. An act to extend the admiralty laws of the United States of America to the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 3110. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States for the education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7532. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Frazer, Mont., in the completion of the high-school building there to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 9064. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Wolf Point, Mont., in the extension of the public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 11499. A bill for restoring and maintaining the purchasing power of the dollar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 694. An act to authorize the sale of interest in lands devised to the United States under the will of Sophie Chanquet; without amendment (Rept. No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LINTHICUM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9892. A bill to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the International Congress of Architects to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1933, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11244) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Tritschler, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11550) to enact a uniform pension law for disabilities incurred in war service and granting pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, marines, and nurses who served the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11551) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 11552) to provide for review of the action of consular officers in refusing immigration visas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 372) requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic and commercial relations with Soviet Government of Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 11553) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 11554) granting an increase of pension to Livery Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 11555) granting a pension to Lillie Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11556) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11557) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Gossard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 11558) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11559) for the relief of A. H. Marshall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11560) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11561) granting a pension to Sarah C. Malone; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11562) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 11563) for the relief of Mrs. Alice C. Wainwright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11564) to provide for the making of emergency loans upon farm lands within the municipality of St. Croix, Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11565) granting a pension to Louise Workman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 11566) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6820. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by Buffalo Post, No. 25, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, urging opposition to reduction of salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

6821. By Mr. BACON: Resolution of Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, New York Commandery, opposing the immediate payment of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6822. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of Hay Fever Association of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., requesting that an investigation be instituted to determine some relief for the hay fever and hay asthma sufferers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6823. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the American Federation of Teachers of New York City, opposing any reduction in Federal salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6824. Also, report on taxation and finance unanimously adopted at a meeting of the New York Board of Trade, New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6825. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the Merchant Tailors Society of New York, opposing the stock transfer tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6826. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the Merchant Tailors Society of New York, urging the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6827. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition from the Presbyterian Missionary Society of Inglewood, Calif., favoring the preservation of the herds of the Eskimos; to the Committee on the Territories.

6828. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the city of New York, opposing the soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6829. Also, petition from the Merchant Tailors Society of the city of New York, urging the Congress to eliminate the proposed stock-transfer tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6830. Also, petition from the Merchants Society of the city of New York, voicing its sincere opposition to the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6831. Also, petition from the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association (Inc.), expressing the opinion that the work that is being performed under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and Smith-Lever laws is not only priceless to American agriculture but of great value to all of the people, and urging the Congress not to make any drastic cut in the appropriations heretofore granted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6832. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of Randolph Perry, of Herkimer, N. Y., and other residents of Herkimer County,

protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6833. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Lundy Orrell, as secretary, and 52 members of the Green Forest Chapter, No. 98, Future Farmers of America, of Green Forest, Ark., protesting against the proposed repeal of the Federal appropriation for vocational agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6834. Also, petition of members of Chapter No. 11 of the Future Farmers of America, of Huntsville, Ark., protesting against the proposed repeal of the Federal appropriations for vocational agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6835. By Mr. GLOVER: Petition of the Future Farmers of America, Malvern High School; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6836. By Mr. JAMES: Petition from Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Hancock, Mich., through M. McMahon, J. D. Shea, Dan Harrington, Michael Shea, John Carney, and Edward Cuff, committee, favoring a tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6837. Also, resolution from the council of the village of Ahmeek, Keweenaw County, Mich., through John Grindatti, president, and Mary Schutte, clerk, favoring a tariff on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6838. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Major Davis, president Dawson School Board, Dawson, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6839. Also, petition of E. E. Nettles, president Kerens National Bank, Kerens, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6840. Also, petition of Hon. J. Luther Broadway, of Madisonville, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6841. Also, resolution passed at annual district convention of twelfth district, Texas Cotton Cooperative Association, opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6842. Also, petition of Howell Brister, president Chamber of Commerce, Kerens, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6843. Also, petition of W. T. Stockton, president First National Bank, Kerens, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6844. Also, petition of J. E. Woods, president Teague National Bank, Teague, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6845. Also, petition of Dr. J. C. Blair, president Kerens Board of Education, Kerens, Tex., opposing suspension for one year of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6846. Also, petition of Second Division, American Legion, Department of Texas, favoring immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6847. By Mr. KELLER: Petition from National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6848. Also, petition of Cloyd E. McGhee, of Mount Vernon, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6849. Also, petition of William E. Barron, of Cairo, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6850. Also, petition of S. B. Thomas, of Cairo, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6851. Also, petition from Local 1492, National Association of Letter Carriers, by Frank L. Veach, secretary, Marion, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6852. Also, petition of postal employees of Benton, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6853. Also, petition of Paul M. Dillow, of Anna, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6854. Also, petition of Federal Employees Association, No. 446, Rock Island, Ill., protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6855. Also, petition from the National Association of United States Civil Service Employees at Navy Yards, New York, protesting against salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6856. Also, petition from Randolph County Rural Letter Carriers, by Don G. Williamson, president, Steeleville, Ill., protesting against pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6857. Also, petition of Rural Letter Carriers of Jackson County, by their president, Edgar G. Gordon, Ava, Ill., protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6858. Also, petition of Perry County Rural Letter Carriers Association, by their president, Logan Thimmig, protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6859. Also, petition of Carbondale (Ill.) Branch, Railway Mail Association, by their president, W. L. Kenney, protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6860. Also, petition from the Illinois State Federation of Labor, protesting against reduction in salaries of Federal workers, pointing out that such reduction will have bad effect upon the economic and industrial life of the Nation; to the Committee on Economy.

6861. Also, petition of John N. Niehouse, Wilbert T. Ribbe, and Henry C. Lemmerman, of Chester, protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6862. Also, petition of Clem T. Hamm, of Chester, Ill., protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6863. Also, petition of A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, protesting against reduction in the Salaries of Federal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

6864. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. H. E. De Lap, of Carbondale, Ill., protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6865. Also, petition of Albert E. Carlson, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against proposed Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6866. Also, petition from Chester (Ill.) Chapter of Future Farmers of America, signed by 23 members, protesting against proposed cuts or elimination of Federal funds for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6867. Also, petition of Charles E. Simmons, president Illinois Rural Letter Carriers Association, Mount Vernon, Ill., in which he speaks for 2,400 rural mail carriers, protesting against Federal salary reductions; to the Committee on Economy.

6868. Also, petition from the Illinois branch of the Railway Mail Association of Chicago, protesting against Federal salary reductions; to the Committee on Economy.

6869. Also, petition of Harold C. Dannenbrink, protesting against Federal pay cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6870. Also, petition from the Ladies' Auxiliary Local, No. 239, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, protesting against the proposed salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6871. Also, petition from the Chicago Post Office Clerks Union, No. 1, protesting against proposed Federal salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6872. Also, petition of Harry F. Wolter, president of Government Workers Local, No. 167, representing 757 employees, Waukegan, Ill., protesting against proposed Federal salary cuts; to the Committee on Economy.

6873. Also, petition from Herrin Chapter, of Future Farmers of America, signed by 33 members of the organization, protesting against elimination of appropriations for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6874. Also, petition of Post Office Clerks Union, No. 1152, Marion, Ill., protesting against Federal salary cut; to the Committee on Economy.

6875. Also, petition from Railway Mail Association of Chicago, protesting against proposed salary reductions by Federal Government; to the Committee on Economy.

6876. Also, petition of citizens of Mound City, Ill., asking favorable action on all bills relating to interstate trucks and busses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6877. Also, petition of citizens of Karnak, Ill., asking favorable action on all bills relating to interstate trucks and busses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6878. Also, petition of citizens of Grand Chain, Ill., asking favorable action on all bills relating to interstate trucks and busses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6879. Also, petition of the following individuals: Herman Sims, (6880) Fred H. Stotlar, (6881) D. E. Odum, (6882) R. D. Blake, (6883) L. A. Sanders, (6884) Hattie L. Grant, (6885) D. D. Smith, (6886) A. A. Simpson, (6887) W. E. Motsinger, (6888) Leon D. Jeter, of Marien, and (6889) Dr. J. S. Williams, of Broughton, Ill., protesting against the proposed reductions of Federal salaries; to the Committee on Economy.

6890. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Joe Martin, John L. Patrick, and other citizens of the city of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the decommissioning of the U. S. S. *Wilmingtton*, Ohio's training ship, and the Navy Department order dispensing with 15 days' training duty for the Ohio Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6891. Also, petition of Louis Woerner, A. R. Rice, and 12 other citizens of Franklin County, Ohio, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as appears to be necessary at this time to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations commonly known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6892. Also, petition of Charles F. Althen, L. H. Shirey, and 25 other citizens of Franklin County, Ohio, petitioning Congress to enact such legislation as is necessary at this time to curb the activities of the growing monopolistic organizations known as the chain-store system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6893. Also, petition of L. H. Allard, R. G. Allen, and numerous other citizens of the city of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the decommissioning of the U. S. S. *Wilmingtton*, Ohio's training ship, and the Navy Department order dispensing with 15 days' training duty for the Ohio Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6894. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the University of the State of New York, the State education department, Albany, N. Y., opposing reduction of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6895. Also, petition of Substitutes Legislative Committee, post office, Schenectady, N. Y., with reference to legislation now pending for their interests; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6896. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by employees of the Schenectady (N. Y.) post office, urging relief for substitute employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6897. Also, resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the New York Commandery, Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, opposing payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6898. Also, resolutions unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the Merchant Tailors' Society of New York, opposing prohibition, the proposed tax on the sale of securities, and the payment of the adjusted-service certificates held by veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6899. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of 15 voters and residents of St. Louis, Mo., urging that high tax on security transfers be removed; that no further soldiers' bonus be paid at this time, and that positive steps be made

to reduce the high cost of government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6900. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of I. P. Herington, of Munnerlyn, Ga., and 16 other citizens of the first congressional district of Georgia, urging the enactment of legislation regulating busses and trucks engaged in hauling passengers and freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6901. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of American Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., with reference to the manufacturers' sales tax and favoring the manufacture and controlling the sale of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6902. Also, petition of Substitutes Legislative Committee, post office, Schenectady, N. Y., favoring certain legislation now pending in their interests before the Post Office Committee; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6903. Also, petition of Dairymen's League Cooperative Association (Inc.), New York, opposing elimination of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6904. Also, petition of Hugh Smith Thompson, 3d, Chapter No. 17, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Castle Point, N. Y., opposing any legislation which would reduce the disability allowance, compensation, or retirement pay of any disabled veteran; to the Committee on Economy.

6905. Also, petition of New York Newspaper Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 2, New York City, opposing the reduction of appropriation of financial aid to the States for promotion and development of vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6906. Also, petition of American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Ill., opposing any reduction of the Federal employees salaries; to the Committee on Economy.

6907. Also, petition of Egleston Bros. & Co. (Inc.), Long Island City, favoring the reduction of the Budget estimates; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6908. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6909. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing the payment of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6910. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society of the City of New York, opposing the stock-transfer tax amendment, and favoring its removal from the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6911. Also, petition of the University of the State of New York, the State education department, Albany, N. Y., opposing elimination of Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Economy.

6912. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolution of Second Division, American Legion of Texas, urging payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6913. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Botts-Florito Post of the American Legion at Le Roy, N. Y., favoring the immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6914. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolution of Alamo Post, No. 2, American Legion, San Antonio, Tex., urging payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6915. Also, petition of Claude R. Moore and several others of Texarkana, Tex., urging passage of legislation providing for a 40-hour week with 44-hour pay in lieu of the present 44-hour week with 48-hour pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6916. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution from the Madison Rotary Club, of Madison, W. Va., protesting against the passage of the Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6917. Also, resolution of the Fayetteville Rotary Club, of Fayetteville, W. Va., protesting against the passage of the

Davis-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6918. By Mr. SUTPHEN: Petition of Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, asking support in rebuilding vocational education appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6919. By Mr. TURPIN: Petition of American Legion Post, No. 176, of Peely, Pa., requesting the passage of legislation for the payment of the full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6920. By the SPEAKER: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, requesting that an investigation be directed immediately by the House of Representatives of the United States to the end that the expenditures of Representative EDWARD LOWBER STOKES may be regulated or limited as prescribed and intended in accordance with the Federal Statutes; to the Committee on Rules.

6921. Also, petition of the First Ward Democratic Club of Yonkers, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on Economy.

SENATE

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1932

(Legislative day of Friday, April 22, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) requesting the President of the United States to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 3584) entitled "An act to require all insurance corporations formed under the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia to maintain their principal offices and places of business within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

FINANCING OF CRIME

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I notice in the morning paper an astonishing statement that Al Capone has again offered to assist in recovering the Lindbergh baby and has actually offered an absolute guarantee that if he is permitted temporarily to leave his sojourn in the Federal penitentiary he will see that the baby is returned within a very few days. His friend has assured Colonel Lindbergh that the return of the baby will be made without the payment of a cent in ransom in addition to that which has already been paid.

Mr. President, this is the second time it has occurred that Al Capone has offered to return the baby if he could get out of jail for a while. Furthermore, the Lindbergh family have been in touch with two of the leading gangsters in New York in an effort to get the baby back. The fact that the Federal and local officials have been baffled for weeks and that it has been necessary to turn to the gangsters and that their leader, who made his money chiefly from the beer racket and from bootleggers, is willing to stake his reputation by guaranteeing that the baby can be returned lends some force to the claim which has frequently been made to me by various people that the kidnaping was done by a friend of Capone for this very purpose.

Furthermore, people have been writing to me from various parts of the country saying that they agree with the resolution adopted by the Los Angeles Aviators' Post of the American Legion, which blames the prohibition laws for the gangsters' activities. Essentially the resolution states that it is their belief that these organized criminal activities have been created and are fostered by the continuance of our existing national prohibition laws which have made enormous profits available for such antisocial groups. I have received letters from various persons in widely separated parts of the United States who tell me that circumstances connected with the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby

have convinced them that the adoption of the eighteenth amendment was a mistake and that it should be repealed. In one letter the father of a family of five children stated that he and his neighbors had until recently been ardent advocates of the eighteenth amendment, but that now they are convinced that it should be repealed.

The crime of kidnaping is not a new crime, and I do not believe that it has been caused by prohibition. At the same time it must be obvious to everyone that the successful financing of crime on a large scale has unquestionably been due to the enormous profits of the bootleggers. The Government has lost hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue which has gone into the bootleggers' pockets as profits. These profits have enabled them to finance crime on a hitherto unparalleled scale.

Although I can not agree fully with my various correspondents who blame the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby entirely on the prohibition laws, I have the greatest sympathy with the position which they have taken, and I do feel that the time has come for the Congress to face the fact called attention to by the Los Angeles aviators, that our existing national prohibition laws have made enormous profits available to gangsters and racketeers. The sooner we repeal the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act and permit each State to pass the kind of prohibition law desired by the majority of its citizens the sooner will we diminish the enormous profits which are now going into the pockets of criminals and helping them to carry out difficult crimes successfully.

I send to the desk the resolution of the Los Angeles Aviators' Post of the American Legion to which I have referred and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas, apparently as the direct result of a dangerous new development of gangster and racketeer activities in this Nation, there has recently been perpetrated a peculiarly heinous crime, to wit, the kidnaping of the infant son of a nationally honored and beloved hero, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh; and

Whereas under stress of the great anxiety occasioned by the said crime Colonel Lindbergh has apparently deemed it necessary to carry on negotiations for the recovery of his child with reputed notorious gangster, racketeer, and other so-called underworld characters rather than depending solely upon the lawfully constituted authorities of his State and of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the perpetration of such a crime and the most regrettable means considered necessary for its solution are both indications of how seriously gangster and racketeer activities have fastened themselves upon the life of the Nation; and

Whereas, in our opinion, such organized criminal activities have been created by and are fostered by the continuance of our existing national prohibition laws, which have made enormous profits available to such antisocial groups: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Aviators' Post, No. 350, of the American Legion, Department of California, petition our Senators and Representatives in Congress to give earnest consideration to such lawful measures as may secure changes in the existing prohibition statutes which will remove the primary cause of the dangerous gangster and racketeer organizations of the country.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., inviting attention to the naval appropriation bill and favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds therein to enable the Federal Government continue its share of the expense of the Naval Reserve, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ASHURST presented a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the Phoenix (Ariz.) Clearing House Association, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Norbeck bill, being the bill (S. 4291) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Pima County, Ariz., remonstrating against proposed reductions in the compensation of Federal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented telegrams, in the nature of memorials, from Fred W. Moore, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Flagstaff and the Chamber of Commerce of Wins-